
External Examiners' report template (Subject Assessment Board)

Section A: Purpose of the External Examiner's report

[Please read this section before writing your report]

External Examiner reports are an integral part of the University's quality monitoring and quality enhancement process and play an important role in the programme review cycle.

The University requires all External Examiners to submit a written report annually. The report should be submitted within **one month** following the final Assessment Board and should not be delayed until re-sit boards have taken place.

The report should focus on the assessments just concluded and should be linked with the aims and outcomes for the qualification and the assessment criteria for each module as described in the programme student handbook.

The University invites External Examiners to be fully objective and to make positive criticism and/or recommendations, where appropriate.

External Examiners' reports are the property of the University and the University will circulate these as it sees fit and in accordance with legislative requirements (see below). The University may choose to anonymise the reports, as appropriate.

External Examiner reports are public documents and are seen by students at Boards of Study meetings. **Please avoid reference by name to individual students and members of staff.**

In addition, under the Freedom of Information Act, the University will provide copies of External Examiners' reports to third parties who make a lawful request for these. Reports will normally retain examiners' names. The University will consider any reasonable request from external examiners to anonymise their reports. Such a request should be made in writing and submitted with the report.

Procedures for the distribution of reports:

1. AQS circulates the report to Faculties, Head of Department and other relevant Services
2. Faculties are required to respond directly to the External Examiner within 8 weeks of receiving the report from AQS. The response to reports submitted late will be required within a shorter time frame
3. Faculties are required to send a copy of the response to AQS
4. Reports containing recommendations relating to University Services will be sent by AQS to the relevant Service with a request that a response is forwarded to AQS within 8 weeks. The response will be forwarded to the External Examiner and the Faculty after consideration by AQS.

Section B: Submission of the report

Please submit your report via email to the following address: **G.Turner@mdx.ac.uk**

**University Quality Enhancement Manager (Externality)
Middlesex University
Hendon Campus
The Burroughs
Hendon
London NW4 4BT**

Payment of your fee is arranged upon receipt of your report, unless the report is referred back for any reason.

Section C: To be completed by the External Examiner

Name	Lee Richardson
Programme	Point Blank: BA/DipHE/CertHE Music Production & Sound Engineering Online
Modules moderated	All
Overseas campuses	Are these modules taught at a Middlesex University overseas campus? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, please specify which locations:
Collaborative Partners	Is this programme (or any modules) delivered at a collaborative partner? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, please specify the name of the partner institution: Point Blank
Date (s) of assessment Board (s) attended	21/09/18

Please complete the following by ticking the appropriate box:

OVERALL STANDARDS	Yes	No
1. In your view, are the standards set for the award(s) appropriate for the qualification(s)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. In your view, are the standards of student performance equivalent to other UK institutions with which you are familiar?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If 'no' to either of the above questions please provide further information in the box below.

To be completed by all external examiners	Yes	No
<p>I confirm that the assessment process was conducted effectively:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Faculty and Programme Team communicated effectively with me throughout the year • I was sent all draft examination papers, (where appropriate), with assessment criteria for approval • I was given sufficient time to approve draft examination papers (where appropriate), with assessment criteria for approval • I was given the opportunity to see samples of marked work (including written assignments and examination scripts) covering the full range of marks • I saw evidence of internal moderation in the assessment process and confirm it was used effectively and consistently 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If 'no' to any of the above questions please provide further information in the box below.

To be completed by external examiners in their 2 nd and subsequent years of appointment	Yes	No
Did you receive formal written feedback on your report for the previous academic year?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Were you satisfied with the response to the issues raised in your report for the previous academic year?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If 'no' to any of the above questions please provide further information in the box below.

Programme/Subject design, content and standards

I reflect the same comment as last year: the content of the qualification is highly detailed and of an excellent academic quality.

The VLE delivery has vastly improved again and it must be praised. In particular staff are prompted to feedback relating to specific LO's instead of the old text box system which encouraged only brief feedback which lacked detail.

Students are able to see their predicted marks throughout their modules and time at Point Blank. I consider this to be a very engaging process for the students and they get a better estimate of how their marks translate to a classification.

On the whole the VLE is better laid out, more intuitive to use, and again I cannot comment any more favourably about this aspect, it is the best example of online delivery I have seen in higher education.

Last year I suggested that course material should change and develop from year to year. At the most recent board Point Blank had taken the decision to make sure assessments change from year to year. This is excellent practice.

Student performance (please avoid reference by name to individual students)

There is a broad range of student performance. I believe the performance to be comparable of standards on other HE courses. The performance, coupled with professional content, is of a standard to which students can appeal to employers. Recruitment seems to be growing and performance continues relative to previous years. Some modules such as Production Portfolio have a narrow range of all high marks – this demonstrates to me that the students are highly engaged in this topic.

Assessments: structure, design and marking

On the whole I am pleased with the level and quality of assessments. As expressed earlier the quality of feedback has much improved by the addition of prompted boxes for specific LO feedback.

The students appear to be well engaged with that process online.

During the year I have commented that some feedback is too brief and that grammar should be improved to match that of academic standard. In response Point Blank have provided some training to staff to improve this. The improvement has been obvious and I will monitor this more in the year ahead.

I would like to point out again that Chris Carter is a good example of feedback, he lays things out neatly, grammar is good and he refers to LO's in a very professional manner.

Assessment Boards

The boards I have attended this year have been well organised despite many staff changes.

Role of the External Examiner

The information I have received before and throughout the board has been clear. The quality of information is fine and access to those resources absolutely perfect. Briony in particular has been very forthcoming with information.

Collaborative Programmes

No comment here.

Recommendations or actions

Many of my recommendation have been carried out this year that at this stage I have no more recommendations. I will be closely monitoring the quality of feedback to students as I feel this needs due time to develop since staff training.

Good practice

It is with great pleasure that I really congratulate what the team at Point Blank have done in the last year to develop the online delivery of their higher education courses – it has been a huge leap forward. All of my points raised have been implemented, I can't ask for more in a year of external examining.