
RVC Teaching Quality Committee – AGENDA ITEM

Executive Summary & Report: MSc VEPH & LHP (DL UoL) External Examiners Report 2019-20

Prepared by: *Christine Thurania McKeever***Presented by:** *n/a*

To be considered at TQC meeting on: 9th March 2021

Action: *to approve*

Approval obtained from other committees/or pending: committee name and meeting date/[expected] date of approval**Reserved item: No**

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To consider response to External Examiner reports for 2019/20.

Documents included:

- a. External Examiner's report from Dr Lisa Boden – Course Director's response and full report
- b. External Examiner's report from Prof Nils Jonnson – Course Director's response and full report

Dr. Lisa Boden
 University of Edinburgh
 Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies
 Easter Bush Veterinary Centre
 Roslin, Midlothian EH25 9RG

28 February 2021

Dear Dr. Boden,

External Examiner’s report for MSc and PG Diplomas in Livestock Health and Production, and Veterinary Epidemiology and Public Health 2020

On behalf of the Royal Veterinary College Board of Examiners for Veterinary Epidemiology and Public Health, and Livestock Health and Production, I would like to thank you for your External Examiner’s report for the University of London Worldwide MSc, PG Diploma and Certificates, in Veterinary Epidemiology and Public Health, and Livestock Health and Production for the 2019-20 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 we have provided our formal response to the key areas, as outlined below:

Examiner Comment	RVC Response
<p>Standards of student performance:</p> <p>1. The students did not perform as well as one might anticipate for an open book exam. The application of material rather than recall, appeared to be a problem for some students.</p>	<p>Responses to comments:</p> <p>1). The open book exam format is one that the students were undertaking for the first time. Detailed guidance was provided to the students, including information on knowledge application rather than recall, allowable resources, referencing requirements, plagiarism etc; nonetheless the format was challenging for some of the cohort, the main difficulty being the ability to synthesise knowledge and provide an answer that was of the right level and overly reliant on study material.</p> <p>In addition to the routine study skills tutorials that are offered to the students, the Programme will provide students with training on undertaking open</p>

<p>2. Standard of marking:</p> <p>VPM013- one examiner provided no feedback at all - only a summary mark. Appreciate the challenges but this makes it nearly impossible to assess. I have made this observation before in previous years for the same course.</p> <p>3. Procedures/arrangements:</p> <p>This year we were under covid-related restrictions. The process was entirely online. The exams were open book. The students didn't perform as highly as one might have anticipated. The external examination process was fine, but a bit clunky. The marking sheets are identified by submission rather than by student so it was difficult to follow the process during the exam board.</p>	<p>book exams, as this is an assessment format that will be increasingly used.</p> <p>2.) All examiners are aware of the requirement and importance of feedback to accompany the marks given. In keeping with the RVC's 'Constitution and Functions of Board of Examiners' the Chair of the Programme's Board of Examiners will liaise with the examiner in question to remind them of the requirement for feedback and to discuss how their annotations may be improved for future.</p> <p>3). The online exams process was new to the Programme and a number of areas for improvement were noted at the end of the process. This includes better harmonisation of the student identifiers on the different marksheets used as all examiners experienced difficulty with the system that had been used.</p>
--	--

Thank you again for your very constructive comments and for your excellent support as external examiner to the Programmes during your term.

Yours sincerely,



Dr. Christine Thurania-McKeever (Programmes Director)

Cc: Professor Javier Guitian (Exam Board Chair)
 Ms. Stephanie Bell (Programme Manager, UoL Worldwide)
 Saran Syanda (Quality Manager, UoL Worldwide)



External / Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report

2019-2020 (2020)

1. Name	Lisa Boden
2. Home institution and/or professional affiliation	University of Edinburgh
3. Role	External Examiner
4. Year of Service	5th
<i>Typically up to four years; extension to 5th year of service under exceptional circumstances only.</i>	
5. Award(s) partially or wholly covered by this report	MSc Livestock Health & Production/Veterinary Epidemiology & Public Health
<i>Only highest award per programme is displayed.</i>	
6. Module(s)/Course(s) covered	LVM004 LVM06 LVM017 VPM012 VPM015 VPM013
<i>Please provide title of each individual module or course you have reviewed. You will be asked to confirm standards of each module further down in the questionnaire.</i>	
7. Date of Board of Examiners meeting	09/12/2020
8. Date of Board of Examiners meeting	09/12/2020
<i>Please provide date of second board meeting, if the report covers more than one board, for example dissertation or project boards, or a second assessment period.</i>	
9. Date of the report	09/12/2020

Part A Summary

Standards of Award

10. The standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level and in this subject. Yes
11. If not, please explain why.

Student performance

12. The standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable Yes

with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which you are familiar.

13. If not, please explain why.

14. If standards are higher than would be expected, please elaborate.

This is an excellent programme with rigorously applied standards and attention to detail.

Conduct of processes

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

Yes

16. If not, please explain why.

17. If processes are of a higher standard than would be expected, please elaborate.

Good Practice and Innovation

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

The programme has adapted well to the circumstances experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic

Part B Standards

19. Please comment on the coherence and currency of the programme or its component parts.

Please provide comments on each individual module in separate paragraphs, highlighting in particular where differences between them occur.

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 [Framework for HE Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies \(FHEQ\)](#).
- For the International Foundation Programme please refer to the [Qualification and Component Levels](#).
- Where applicable, please refer to the relevant [Subject Benchmark Statements](#).

This is a high standard programme which is a leader in the field.

20. The standard of assessment in each module is comparable to modules of the same level.

Please consider for each module.

Some of the modules I have reviewed are not comparable

21. If the standard of assessment is not comparable to modules or courses of the same level, please elaborate.

Please provide details for all modules that are not comparable.

VPM013- limited feedback from one examiner. This makes it challenging to assess re borderline students.

22. The standard of assessment is comparable to modules of the same level as for students at University of London member institutions.

Please consider for each module.

This question is aimed at External and Intercollegiate Examiners who are appointed to University of London distance and flexible learning Boards of Examiners and are also appointed as External or Intercollegiate Examiners to Boards of Examiners assessing students for the equivalent programme based at a member institution.

Yes - all of the modules I have reviewed are comparable

23. If the standard of assessment is not comparable to modules of the same level as for students at University of London member institutions, please elaborate.

Please provide details for all modules that are not comparable.

24. The standard of assessment is comparable to modules of the same level at your own University of London member institution.

Please consider for each module.

This question is aimed at Intercollegiate Examiners from one of the member institutions of the University of London.

Yes - all of the modules I have reviewed are comparable

25. If the standard of assessment is not comparable to modules of the same level at your own University of London member institution, please elaborate.

Please provide details for all modules that are not comparable.

26. The assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level.

Please consider for each module.

Yes - all of the modules I have reviewed are set at the appropriate level

27. If the assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are not set at the appropriate level, please elaborate.

Please provide details for all modules that are not set at the appropriate level.

28. Please comment on the standards of student performance.

Where relevant, please make reference to performance on individual modules.

You may want to include:

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

The students did not perform as well as one might anticipate for an open book exam. The application of material rather than recall, appeared to be a problem for some students.

Part C Programme and assessment design

29. The aims and learning outcomes for the programme and modules/courses are clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter. <i>Please consider for the programme as a whole and for each module you have been asked to review.</i>
Yes - the aims and learning outcomes are set at an appropriate level for the programme and modules/courses
30. If the aims and learning outcomes for the programme and modules/courses are not clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter, please elaborate. <i>Please provide details for the programme as a whole and any modules without clearly defined aims and learning outcomes.</i>
31. Please comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment (i.e. unseen written exams, coursework, dissertation, etc.). <i>Please consider for the programme as a whole and for each module you have been asked to review.</i> <i>Please comment in relation to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the subject • the students • the respective level of study • the expected learning outcomes.
The level of study and intended learning outcomes are appropriate for this programme in its entirety and its component modules.
32. Please comment on the usefulness of study materials and the Virtual Learning Environment in relation to the expected learning outcomes. <i>Where relevant, please comment on individual modules.</i>
These are very helpful.
33. Please comment on the overall quality of programme and assessment design and structure.
A world-renowned masters programme of a very high standard.

Part D Assessment Process

Information	
34. Did you receive all necessary information regarding your appointment?	Yes
35. 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
36. Did you receive this information in good time?	Yes
37. Did you have sufficient access to any additional material needed to make the required judgements?	Yes
38. Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you.	
Very useful. Thanks to the administrative staff at RVC.	

Paper-setting [Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]	
39. Did you receive all the draft papers that you wished to see?	Yes
40. Was the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework appropriate? <i>Please consider for the programme as a whole and for each module you have been asked to review.</i>	
Yes - the nature, spread and level of assessment questions/coursework is appropriate for the programme and modules/courses	
41. If the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework was not appropriate, please elaborate. <i>Please provide details for all modules where the nature, spread and level is not appropriate.</i>	
42. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments in the paper-setting process?	Yes
43. Please add any other comments on the paper-setting process. <i>Where relevant, please comment on individual modules.</i>	
No further comments	
Marking and sampling [Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]	
44. Did you receive the scripts or other assessed work in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment?	Yes
45. 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? <i>Please consider for each module.</i>	Yes
46. Did you see a representative sample of scripts and other assessed work assessed as first class, borderline or fail?	Yes
47. Were you satisfied with the standard of marking? <i>Please consider for each module you have been asked to review.</i>	
Some of the modules/courses were not marked to the same standard	
48. If you were not satisfied with the standard of marking, please elaborate. <i>Please provide details for all modules where the standard of marking was not satisfactory.</i>	
VPM013- one examiner provided no feedback at all - only a summary mark. Appreciate the challenges but this makes it nearly impossible to assess. I have made this observation before in previous years for the same course.	
49. Were you satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked or second-marked and moderated? <i>Please consider for each module you have been asked to review.</i> <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>	
Yes - assessment for all modules was marked in accordance with the guidelines	

50. If you were not satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked or second-marked and moderated, please elaborate. <i>Please provide details for each module.</i>	
Dissertations / project reports	
51. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations / project reports appropriate? <i>Please consider for all modules where appropriate.</i>	N/A
Oral assessment	
52. Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct and/or moderate oral components of assessment? <i>Please consider for all modules where appropriate.</i>	N/A
53. Please provide any comments on scripts and other assessed work. <i>Where relevant, please comment on individual modules.</i>	
No further comments	
Board of Examiners meeting(s) and results	
54. Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes
55. Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes
56. 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
57. 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?	
58. Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?	Yes
59. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?	Yes
60. Please provide any comments on the Board of Examiners' meetings and decisions.	
No further comments	

Part E Other Comments

61. Please provide comments relating to Professional and Statutory Body requirements, if applicable.
No further comments
62. How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?
This year we were under covid-related restrictions. The process was entirely online. The exams were open book. The students didn't perform as highly as one might have anticipated. The external examination process was fine, but a bit clunky. The marking sheets are identified by submission rather than by student so it was difficult to follow the process during the exam board.

63. Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken into account.

I have commented on multiple occasions that for VPM013, the examiners should provide more detailed feedback. This has not happened.

64. 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 distance and flexible learning programmes or the School of Advanced Study.

The programme has gone from strength to strength in the last 5 years. the students continue to perform to a high standard due to excellent teaching and rigorous standards set at the RVC.

65. Please provide any other comments you may have.

Please use this box for responding to any specific questions the Programme Team may have asked you to consider.

No further comments.

Professor Nick Jonsson
College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences
University of Glasgow,
464 Bearsden Rd,
Bearsden G61 1Q

28 February 2021

Dear Professor Jonsson

External Examiner's report for MSc and PG Diplomas in Livestock Health and Production, and Veterinary Epidemiology and Public Health 2020

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 2019-20 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 we have provided our formal response to the key areas, as outlined below:

Examiner Comment	RVC Response
<p>Appropriateness and balance of types of assessment</p> <p>1). Covid was an important element of the assessment this year. The response was very sound. Most papers were reasonably adapted to the open-book format.</p> <p>Workload commitment: marking these documents in digital form and providing feedback was much more time consuming for academic staff than in the past.</p> <p>Examination questions: The open-book approach highlights the need for masters level assessment to be at a postgraduate level – at higher levels of</p>	<p>Responses to comments:</p> <p>1). The move to online assessment in open-book format had to be done quickly and with little preparation time both for academic staff and students. The exams questions had to be re-written to suit the open-book format and although most questions did this successfully, in some instances some still had sections that were oriented towards recall.</p> <p>Training in preparing open-book assessment has been recognised as an area of support for academic staff and this is an area of work that will be undertaken by the College.</p>

the cognitive hierarchy. Some of the exams are oriented strongly to factual recall.

2). Choice in examinations: There does not seem to be a compelling reason for students to be offered choice among questions in exam papers. Some questions are intrinsically harder than others. Where there is a small number of students who have answered one question, it is somewhat difficult to compare marking. Choice of question is currently a feature in some of the courses (LHM001, LHM002, LHM009, LHM016) but not others (LVM019, VPM018, LHM020, LVM014).

2). The modules that provide a choice are those that cover multiple species, allowing students to make the choice to focus on those that are of particular interest to them. If the choice were to be removed, then students would be compelled to study all the species covered, in order to be prepared for the exam.

This will be raised for discussion with the respective module leaders, to consider if changes should be made to the content or the question choices provided.

Thank you again for your constructive comments and for the time taken to support to the programme during this examination cycle.

Yours sincerely,



Dr. Christine Thurania-McKeever (Programme Director)

Cc: Professor Javier Guitian (Exam Board Chair)
Ms. Stephanie Bell (Programme Manager, UoL Worldwide)
Sarah Syanda (Quality Manager, UoL Worldwide)



External / Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report

2019-2020 (2020)

1. Name	Nicholas JONSSON
2. Home institution and/or professional affiliation	University of Glasgow
3. Role	External Examiner
4. Year of Service	2nd
<i>Typically up to four years; extension to 5th year of service under exceptional circumstances only.</i>	
5. Award(s) partially or wholly covered by this report	MSc Livestock Health & Production/Veterinary Epidemiology & Public Health
<i>Only highest award per programme is displayed.</i>	
6. Module(s)/Course(s) covered	Module LHM001: Current Concepts in Animal Diseases Module LHM002: Principles of Livestock Production Module LHM009: Reproduction and Fertility Module LHM016: Animal Welfare Module LVM019: Economics for Livestock Development and Policy Module VPM018: Developing and Monitoring Livestock Production Systems Module LHM020: Sustainable livestock systems in the environment Module LVM014: Research design, management and grant writing
<i>Please provide title of each individual module or course you have reviewed. You will be asked to confirm standards of each module further down in the questionnaire.</i>	
7. Date of Board of Examiners meeting	09/12/2020
8. Date of Board of Examiners meeting	09/12/2020
<i>Please provide date of second board meeting, if the report covers more than one board, for example dissertation or project boards, or a second assessment period.</i>	
9. Date of the report	09/12/2020

Part A Summary

Standards of Award	
10. The standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level and in this subject.	Yes
11. If not, please explain why.	
Student performance	
12. 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
13. If not, please explain why.	
14. If standards are higher than would be expected, please elaborate.	
Conduct of processes	
15. The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted.	Yes
16. If not, please explain why.	
17. If processes are of a higher standard than would be expected, please elaborate.	
Good Practice and Innovation	
18. Please comment on any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes. Please highlight any items of good practice in programme arrangements and/or procedures for external examination.	
The feedback on examinations and TMAs ranged from good to exemplary. The workload involved in provision of feedback at this level is great and all involved should be commended.	

Part B Standards

19. Please comment on the coherence and currency of the programme or its component parts.

Please provide comments on each individual module in separate paragraphs, highlighting in particular where differences between them occur.

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 [Framework for HE Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies \(FHEQ\)](#).
- For the International Foundation Programme please refer to the [Qualification and Component Levels](#).
- Where applicable, please refer to the relevant [Subject Benchmark Statements](#).

The programme exactly meets its intended aims and ILOs. It is taught at an appropriate level and its currency is high.

20. The standard of assessment in each module is comparable to modules of the same level.

Please consider for each module.

Yes - all of the modules I have reviewed are comparable

21. If the standard of assessment is not comparable to modules or courses of the same level, please elaborate.

Please provide details for all modules that are not comparable.

22. The standard of assessment is comparable to modules of the same level as for students at University of London member institutions.

Please consider for each module.

This question is aimed at External and Intercollegiate Examiners who are appointed to University of London distance and flexible learning Boards of Examiners and are also appointed as External or Intercollegiate Examiners to Boards of Examiners assessing students for the equivalent programme based at a member institution.

N/A

23. If the standard of assessment is not comparable to modules of the same level as for students at University of London member institutions, please elaborate.

Please provide details for all modules that are not comparable.

24. The standard of assessment is comparable to modules of the same level at your own University of London member institution.

Please consider for each module.

This question is aimed at Intercollegiate Examiners from one of the member institutions of the University of London.

N/A

25. If the standard of assessment is not comparable to modules of the same level at your own University of London member institution, please elaborate.

Please provide details for all modules that are not comparable.

26. The assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level.

Please consider for each module.

Yes - all of the modules I have reviewed are set at the appropriate level

27. If the assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are not set at the appropriate level, please elaborate.

Please provide details for all modules that are not set at the appropriate level.

28. Please comment on the standards of student performance.

Where relevant, please make reference to performance on individual modules.

You may want to include:

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

The performance of students covered a wide range of attainment levels, but the majority achieved satisfactorily. This reflects the diverse circumstances and backgrounds of the students, some of whom are likely constrained by local infrastructure and language challenges. Given the broad appeal of this programme for students in the developing world, some of these challenges are likely intractable. However, the programme staff have taken pains to ensure that the content is accessible and the assessment is fair without compromising on standards.

Part C Programme and assessment design

29. The aims and learning outcomes for the programme and modules/courses are clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter.

Please consider for the programme as a whole and for each module you have been asked to review.

Yes - the aims and learning outcomes are set at an appropriate level for the programme and modules/courses

30. If the aims and learning outcomes for the programme and modules/courses are not clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter, please elaborate.

Please provide details for the programme as a whole and any modules without clearly defined aims and learning outcomes.

31. Please comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment (i.e. unseen written exams, coursework, dissertation, etc.).

Please consider for the programme as a whole and for each module you have been asked to review.

Please comment in relation to:

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

Covid was an important element of the assessment this year. The response was very sound. Most papers were reasonably adapted to the open-book format.

Workload commitment: marking these documents in digital form and providing feedback was much more time consuming for academic staff than in the past.

Feedback: The feedback on examinations and TMAs ranged from good to exemplary. The workload involved in provision of feedback at this level is great and all involved should be commended.

Choice in examinations: There does not seem to be a compelling reason for students to be offered

a choice among questions in exam papers. Some questions are intrinsically harder than others. Where there is a small number of students who have answered one question, it is somewhat difficult to compare marking. Choice of question is currently a feature in some of the courses (LHM001, LHM002, LHM009, LHM016) but not others (LVM019, VPM018, LHM020, LVM014). Examination questions: The open-book approach highlights the need for masters level assessment to be at a postgraduate level – at higher levels of the cognitive hierarchy. Some of the exams are oriented strongly to factual recall.

1. LHM001 Current Concepts in Animal Diseases; Exams: Overall, no adverse comments except that I do not believe that the students should have the choice of questions. It is not possible to demonstrate with this sample size, but it seems quite likely that some of the questions are inherently less likely to score the same marks as others. TMAs: The feedback on the epidemiology-related paper is exceptional.
2. LHM002 Principles of Livestock Production; Exams: The paper was reasonably well answered by the candidates. The marks were in quite a narrow band over all the questions and students. On viewing the marks, I was initially surprised, but on checking the papers, I agree with the narrow band. No papers stand out as particularly bad and even the best papers have quite a few sections that could be improved. Feedback from the examiners was good, as was the inter-examiner agreement. TMAs: In my opinion, the quality of the TMA samples varied, and the marks seemed a little inconsistent with the quality of the work presented.
3. LHM009 Reproduction and Fertility; Exams: The exam paper is acceptable but not ideal for open-book type of examination. Given the time-frame of the response required to Covid, it is reasonable, but for future years, if open-book is required, the questions should be more problem-oriented. Good quality feedback on questions. High level of agreement between examiners.
4. LHM016 Animal Welfare; Exams: Good agreement of marks and feedback between the examiners. Overall good quality of responses. No criticism of the papers although only 40% of the paper was answered by both candidates. TMAs: Including the questions was very helpful here. Feedback and grading seems to be very appropriate.
5. LVM019 Economics for Livestock Development and Policy; Exams: Questions seem to be well suited to open book format, although similarity of responses suggests that the questions largely address course material. Good agreement between markers, with good range of marks. Detailed and helpful feedback on exam questions. TMAs: Excellent, detailed and helpful feedback.
6. VPM018 Developing and Monitoring Livestock Production Systems; Exams: Nice no choice in questions. Good agreement of markers. Excellent, detailed feedback on exam questions. TMAs: Would be helpful to have the assignment briefs.
7. LHM020 Sustainable livestock systems in the environment; Exams: Very consistent marking by both examiners. Excellent, detailed, and helpful feedback. Marks awarded to candidates seem quite fair. TMAs: Good contrast between the two examples provided. Clear differentiation and appropriate marks.
8. LVM014: Close agreement of examiners. Good range of marks. Excellent and detailed feedback on each of the questions. Best was excellent. Worst was clearly deficient in some respects.

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

Where relevant, please comment on individual modules.

All materials provided and the VLE are of a consistently high standard.

33. Please comment on the overall quality of programme and assessment design and structure.

The programme is excellent overall. Very professionally delivered and assessed.

Part D Assessment Process

Information

34. Did you receive all necessary information regarding your appointment?

Yes

35. 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
36. Did you receive this information in good time?	Yes
37. Did you have sufficient access to any additional material needed to make the required judgements?	Yes
38. Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you.	
From external examiner's perspective, it is difficult to look carefully at individual student performance if they are at risk – candidate number doesn't match up with exam ID and not clear if student is overall in danger of a fail (due to incomplete marksheet for the module overall).	
Paper-setting [Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]	
39. Did you receive all the draft papers that you wished to see?	Yes
40. Was the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework appropriate? <i>Please consider for the programme as a whole and for each module you have been asked to review.</i>	
Yes - the nature, spread and level of assessment questions/coursework is appropriate for the programme and modules/courses	
41. If the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework was not appropriate, please elaborate. <i>Please provide details for all modules where the nature, spread and level is not appropriate.</i>	
42. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments in the paper-setting process?	Yes
43. Please add any other comments on the paper-setting process. <i>Where relevant, please comment on individual modules.</i>	
Covered previously in this report. All is good. Adaptation to Covid very challenging but managed very well.	
Marking and sampling [Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]	
44. Did you receive the scripts or other assessed work in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment?	Yes
45. 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? <i>Please consider for each module.</i>	Yes
46. Did you see a representative sample of scripts and other assessed work assessed as first class, borderline or fail?	Yes
47. Were you satisfied with the standard of marking? <i>Please consider for each module you have been asked to review.</i>	
Yes - the standard of marking was appropriate for all modules/courses	

<p>48. If you were not satisfied with the standard of marking, please elaborate.</p> <p><i>Please provide details for all modules where the standard of marking was not satisfactory.</i></p>	
<p>49. Were you satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked or second-marked and moderated?</p> <p><i>Please consider for each module you have been asked to review.</i></p> <p>Assessed work for University of London Track C programmes is second marked and moderated on a sample basis as per the Guidelines for Examinations.</p>	
<p>Yes - assessment for all modules was marked in accordance with the guidelines</p>	
<p>50. If you were not satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked or second-marked and moderated, please elaborate.</p> <p><i>Please provide details for each module.</i></p>	
<p>Dissertations / project reports</p>	
<p>51. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations / project reports appropriate?</p> <p><i>Please consider for all modules where appropriate.</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Oral assessment</p>	
<p>52. Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct and/or moderate oral components of assessment?</p> <p><i>Please consider for all modules where appropriate.</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>53. Please provide any comments on scripts and other assessed work.</p> <p><i>Where relevant, please comment on individual modules.</i></p>	
<p>Already covered in this report.</p>	
<p>Board of Examiners meeting(s) and results</p>	
<p>54. Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>55. Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>56. Were you able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting?</p> <p><i>'Final Board of Examiners' meeting' – a meeting where awards are confirmed.</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>57. 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?</p>	
<p>58. Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>59. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>60. Please provide any comments on the Board of Examiners' meetings and decisions.</p>	
<p>Well run, professional meeting. Covered all relevant matters.</p>	

Part E Other Comments

61. Please provide comments relating to Professional and Statutory Body requirements, if applicable.
No comments to make here
62. How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?
Essentially the same, with Covid modifications
63. Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken into account.
Well considered and mostly implemented - see comments above regarding choice in questions.
64. 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 distance and flexible learning programmes or the School of Advanced Study.
NA
65. Please provide any other comments you may have.
<i>Please use this box for responding to any specific questions the Programme Team may have asked you to consider.</i>