

School of Engineering and Built Environment

External Examiner Reports

2013/14

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	
Modules only	X

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

CTR09126 Transport Engineering
CTR09119 Railway Engineering
CTR101024 Modelling Transport

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BEng Civil and Transportation Engineering
BEng Civil Engineering
MEng Civil Engineering
MEng Civil & Transportation Engineering

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	YES	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	YES	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	YES	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	YES	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The standard of student work was of a similar standard to that carried out in comparable courses in other HEIs. The nature of the course and expertise of those teaching the course allows a degree of specialisation (in transportation) beyond that which can be achieved in many comparable civil engineering courses.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

The academic standard of each module I viewed was of an appropriate standard.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

I had the opportunity to inspect coursework and examination scripts for CTR09126 and CTR09119. There was a reasonable spread of marks in each module. Student work was of a reasonable standard. At the top end of the class, student work was very professionally executed.

I did not have a chance to view student work from CTR10124.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

I didn't have time to explore learning and teaching methods in any detail with those teaching these modules. There was a combination of exam plus a significant piece of coursework for these modules. The coursework (TA and Railway Design) was set within realistic contexts and required students to collect and organise data and apply design standards/guidelines in a way which mirrors professional practice.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

Assessment was carried out using a marking scheme which clearly explained to students those areas of good or less good work and justified marks awarded. Having sampled coursework scripts this would appear to have been done in a fair and transparent fashion. Exam papers were double-marked.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

Exam questions required students to recall module material or follow procedures; this is reasonable within an examination context. Some consideration should be given to introducing more challenging questions as minor part of each question which requires students to apply concepts or methods.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

	X	
	X	
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

X		
X		
X		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		
X		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

		X
--	--	---

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the

X		
		X

opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

X		
X		
X		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	x
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers

(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

Undergraduate

MEC09101 – Materials for Product Manufacture (Online delivery)

MEC09100 Plastics Product Design

MEC10103 - Advanced Materials in Sport

Postgraduate

MEC11109 – Ceramic and Composite Materials

MEC11110 – Energy Materials

MEC11112 – Forensic Materials Engineering

MEC11115 – Metallic Materials

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?	X	
Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?	X	
Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?	X	

Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?	X	
---	---	--

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The standard is high and comparable to international standards in the field.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

This is appropriate.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

Student performance is monitored closely with appropriate mechanisms for assistance and mentoring.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

Learning and teaching methods are of a high standard.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

Feedback is thorough and rigorous. This is commendable.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

Projects are based on leading edge subject in areas such as polymers, fuel cells, renewable energy domains and materials for sport. The output is of a very high standard.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

X		
X		
X		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		
X		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

X		

- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

X		
X		
X		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

I wish to commend the organization and conduct of the exam board and the materials academic team. The overall standard of education is high in the materials and polymer domains with many interesting research projects available to the students. The provision is student centred with much effort in feedback mechanisms and mentoring. In summary, a highly motivated team with excellent course provision and innovation in the materials areas.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	X
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers

(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

- ELE09100 Electrical Systems
- ELE09102 Electronic Systems
- ELE09103 Electrical Supply
- ELE09104 Engineering Applications - Electrical and Electronic
- ELE09108 Individual Project
- ELE09109 Individual Project (Distance Learning)
- ELE09113 Signal Processing
- ELE09114 Integrated Engineering Design
- ELE09802 Electronic Systems (HK)
- ELE09804 Engineering Applications [Electrical] (HK)
- ELE10101 Transmission & Networks
- ELE10102 Electrical Machines
- ELE10104 Power Systems
- ELE10105 Programmable Logic Design
- ELE10106 Electronic Drives
- ELE10108 Honours Project
- ELE10111 Embedded Systems
- ELE10112 Engineering Electronics
- ELE10113 Digital System Design
- ELE10812 Engineering Electronics (HK)

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

- BEng(Hons) Electronic & Computer Engineering
- BEng(Hons) Electronic & Electrical Engineering
- BEng(Hons) Electrical Engineering

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	X	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	X	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	X	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	X	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The standard of work is quite comparable at both ends of the spectrum and importantly, the reward for student effort is likewise comparable. The students in Napier also get regular and comprehensive feedback which is driving their output. The cycle of assessment and feedback is timely and well documented.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Yes, the standard in each module in terms of content, modes of delivery and assessment is being set and maintained at an appropriate level. The moderation process, both internal and external, is ensuring that the standard is also consistent across the set of modules/programmes. This creates a coherent and integrated learning environment in which academics and learners can thrive.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

The assessment methodology in each module is designed to reward students who engage the module content in its broadest sense. This is good for the learning breadth of the module and consequently the overall programme objectives. In every exam session, across all modules, there is evidence among the assessment work from high achieving students that the opportunity to excel is there and they are using it; I refer particularly to project based activities across several modules in the recent session.

In relation to student weaknesses, the ability to express oneself, to have coherent thought, to self-reflect and to communicate at a professional standard are all areas on which to differentiate between students and they are all areas which receive much interest universally. And so, in any quorate cohort of students there will be variations in the quality of offerings but it is clear that within the SEBE, the assessment templates, advice and regular feedback are holding a standard to which students can aspire and do achieve. In some of the submitted project/assignment work, the written presentations and self/critical evaluation statements are of the highest quality while in the weaker work the comments and pointers from the academic staff are a constant reminder to the student of where they should be.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

Judging from the deliverable specifications and the submitted material across my list of modules, my assumption is that the L&T methods are blended to good effect using a range of up to date resources and the balance is continuously being reviewed and tuned.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

The assessment process is highly regulated in terms of the preparation of assessment material. In return, the submitted material is very well commented on by academic staff during correction and if students read and absorbed this feedback it would be most beneficial to their development. It is also clear that dates/times for handing up work are being enforced.

I also notice that there is good correlation between coursework results and end-of-term results across modules which suggests that the process produces a clear picture of the individual student effort while not constraining the added value that a group effort brings to the learning process.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

In my last report I highlighted learning activities within particular modules as being examples of good practice. With a bit more time served, I would like to compliment the Napier SEBE staff in general on the processes in which I am involved. Material to be moderated always arrives in good time, arrangements to visit are always taken care of, facilities to do the work of an extern are ready and waiting on arrival and the business of the exam boards is conducted in an open, transparent and if necessary, a robust manner; a job always well done.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

Not a recommendation, more an observation: the SEBE makes a specific point of including quite detailed statistics on every module set of results which is of interest and it is informative. However, the stats can very occasionally steer an individual module conversation towards a group mark adjustment, e.g. up/down by a particular amount, which is allowed under regulations; all present are allowed to have a view on this, not just the internal/external examiner(s). I wonder if some pre-MBE analysis could take place which might look at the reasons why a set of results is skewed and that events could be pinpointed. Then, for clear and well-defined reasons, adjustments could be made on a more selective basis, i.e. still considered at group level perhaps but down at particular assessment elements. In my own institution, module/programme results simply fall wherever but in the very rare case of a 'structural' issue where an entire module class has been disadvantaged, the internal/external examiners and Head of Dept. discuss a solution behind closed doors.

--

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

X		
X		
X		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		
X		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the

X		

opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

X		
X		
X		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

No other comments at this time.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	YES
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers

(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

BSV09102 – Building Design and Technology 3

BSV09105 – Architectural Technology 3

BSV10100 – Project Evaluation

BSV10110 – Architectural Technology 4

BSV 10112 – Architectural Practice and Management

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BSc (Hons) Architectural Technology

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	YES	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	YES	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	YES	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	YES	

Section C:

<p>1) Comparability Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.</p>
<p>The samples of work inspected during this period have been comparable with work at similar institutions.</p>
<p>2) Commentary on Academic issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the subject benchmark statements and SCQF level descriptors</p>
<p>The academic standard is good and is being maintained at an appropriate level.</p>
<p>3) Student Performance Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content</p>
<p>As a general comment the standard of student performance is typical of a programme in Architectural Technology, with the design work tending to be stronger than the written work. This tends to reflect the interests of the students rather than any reflection on the programme or the standard of teaching and assessment.</p>
<p>4) Learning and Teaching Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes</p>
<p>Learning and teaching methods are varied across the programme and appear to be effective.</p>
<p>5) Assessment Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes</p>
<p>Assessment is consistent across modules and within the programme. This appears to be fair and rigorous. Feedback also appears to follow good practice.</p>
<p>6) Good practice Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight</p>
<p>The modules and programme are well designed and thought through. The good practice relates to the dedication of a small core team who are passionate about their subject area and the programme, this is reflected in the teaching and the student work.</p>

7) Recommendations Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.
I do not have any specific recommendations to make this year.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
------------	-----------	-----------

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

Y		
Y		
Y		
Y		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

Y		
Y		
Y		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

Y		
Y		
Y		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

Y		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

	N	
Y		
		n/a
Y		
Y		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

a) I believe that the programme is designed and operated in accordance with the requirements of CIAT

b) This is my fourth and final year, so some reflection may be useful. Throughout my time as an external examiner at Napier I have found the course team and administrative staff to be friendly, welcoming and professional. Comments relating to improvements have been addressed quickly and a few small improvements have made for a better programme. The dedication of a very small course team is exemplary, and something that is recognised by the students. Standards of teaching, learning and assessment have remained consistently good and the performance of the students appears to be improving year on year. The technical aspects of the programme are particularly strong. This is a very good Architectural Technology programme and it has been a pleasure to have been associated with it over the past four years.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk



EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	Yes
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers

(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

BSV09101 Surveying 3

BSV09106 Surveying 4

BSV10111

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BSc (Hons) Building Surveying FT and PT

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	Yes	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	Yes	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	Yes	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	Yes	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The work that I looked at in relation to the three modules for which I am responsible was appropriately assessed and the standard of student work accords with that of students that I have assessed at my own and other institutions.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

The standards are being maintained.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

The student performance that I have observed at module and programme level follows a similar pattern to those experienced at my own institution.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

The learning and teaching methods adopted are appropriate and the use of practical work where relevant is excellent. The students that I met before the Programme board in June were very complimentary of their project based work that involved working with other disciplines.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

I am happy from the work that I have seen, the boards attended and the students met that the assessment and feedback process is fair and rigorous.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

The course content and assessments are similar to those in my own and other institutions that I have externally examined and the work maps to the relevant RICS APC competencies.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

The year 3 and 4 students that I met were very complimentary about the course and the way it is delivered. They did question whether the content of the Autocad module in the first year was appropriate as they did not feel that it gave them the skills needed later in the course to tackle the Building Control and Fire Engineering Module which required CAD detailing skills. I cannot comment further on this as I am not familiar with the modules referred to but the course team may wish to look at this.

--

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

yes		
yes		
yes		
yes		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

yes		
yes		
yes		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to

yes		
yes		
yes		

enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

--	--	--

Dissertations/Project reports

a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

yes		
-----	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

a. Were you able to attend the meeting?

yes		
-----	--	--

b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

		n/a
--	--	-----

c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?

yes		
-----	--	--

d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

yes		
-----	--	--

e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

yes		
-----	--	--

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

The course appears to be in good health and the students that I met were complimentary of the course leader and course team.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	✓
Modules only	✓

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers

(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

BSV09113 Building Control and Fire Engineering
BSV09114 Building Services Engineering
BSV10105 Construction Project Management
BSV10111 Dissertation

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BSc (Hons) Building Surveying FT and PT

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	✓	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	✓	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	✓	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	N/A	N/A

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

I don't have any involvement with any other higher education institutions and therefore am unable provide comment on comparability of standards.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

The academic standard of each module or programme of study has been set at an appropriate level and that this level is being maintained.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

Student performance has again been good with very good results. There are due to be three first class (BSc Hons) Building Surveying degrees awarded. As there are a total of eight graduating, this is an excellent result.

As in past years poor performance stems from students who fail to engage properly in the course either through lack of interest or other commitments.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

Varied learning and teaching methods are utilised on the course, including lectures, site visits and individual research through assignments project work.

Course work is noted to be relevant, challenging and interesting. As far as possible it is current in terms of what's happening within the industry giving students an insight of the real world.

Student feedback has been incredibly positive with enthusiastic comments and praise for the course generally. In addition, student feedback on teaching staff was very complimentary which is very encouraging.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

Assessment methods are rigorous and fair, with evidence of good student feedback. Marking also appears to be consistent and fair.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

As far as possible the modules are based on current and relevant topics which gives students an insight into what is happening in industry. This is good practice and should be maintained as it will be beneficial for students when seeking future employment.

As in previous years students find the multidisciplinary course project highly enjoyable and interesting.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

Continue with ad-hoc lectures from external parties on topical issues, as students generally find these valuable and interesting.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

✓		
✓		
✓		
✓		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

✓		
✓		
✓		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

✓		
✓		
✓		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

✓		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the

✓		
		✓

opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

✓		
✓		
✓		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Close links with the RICS should be encouraged and students should become student members to take an interest and keep in touch with what is happening in their profession.

Following on for last year and my comments on AutoCad, I am pleased to see that a CAD module has been introduced. It may be appropriate to consider introducing some basic building layout, elevation and section training to this module.

The programme and module boards continue to be efficiently and well run.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	x
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

CTR09101 Methods of Construction
 CTR09103 Structural Timber Design 1
 CTR09108 Applied Structural Design 1
 CTR10106 Applied Structural Design 2
 CTR10125 Geotechnics 3 and geoenvironmental engineering in practice
 CTR09111 Water Engineering
 CTR09130 Geotechnics 2 in Practice
 CTR10109 Environmental Hydraulics
 CTR10110 Structural Timber Design 2
 CTR10111 Construction Law and Contracts

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BSc (Hons) Civil Engineering, BSc(Hons) Construction Engineering, BSc (Hons) Civil and Timber Engineering

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	x	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	x	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	x	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	x	

Section C:

<p>1) Comparability Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.</p>
<p>The student work seems consistent with the standards of equivalent HEIs</p>
<p>2) Commentary on Academic issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the subject benchmark statements and SCQF level descriptors</p>
<p>I am satisfied with the academic standard of all of the modules in the programme.</p>
<p>3) Student Performance Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content</p>
<p>I did not get a chance to attend exam board this year but in the past the distributions of student performance were broadly in line with what I have seen in the exam boards in my own institution</p>
<p>4) Learning and Teaching Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes</p>
<p>The teaching methods employed seem effective in helping most students achieve the desired learning outcomes in all modules.</p>
<p>5) Assessment Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes</p>
<p>I am satisfied that the assessment processes employed are rigorous in all modules</p>

6) Good practice Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight
The internal checking process of exam papers and the documentation provided are excellent.
7) Recommendations Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.
The system is working well in my opinion and for now I do not have any recommendations

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
------------	-----------	-----------

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

	x	
x		
x		
x		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

x		
x		
		x

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)

	x	
--	---	--

b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?			X
c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?			X

Dissertations/Project reports

a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?	X		
---	---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

a. Were you able to attend the meeting?		X	
b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?		X	
c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?			X
d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?			X
e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?			X

<p>Any other comments? Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to</p> <p>a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).</p>
<p>This was the final year that I carried out duties as external examiner for Edinburgh Napier University. Although I was unable to attend the exam board meetings this year, I have been general very impressed with the system in place at Napier for ensuring that their programme and module assessment processes are robust and fair to the their students. The system for communicating with external examiners is also very professional and works efficiently. It has been a very pleasant experience all in all.</p>

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	X
Modules only	X

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

BSV 09100 Construction Management 2

BSV 09109 Construction Project Management 1

BSV 10104 Sustainable Development

BSV10111 Dissertation

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BSc (Hons) Construction Project Management

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	Yes	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	Yes	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	Yes	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	Yes	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The standard of student work in both coursework and examination are consistent and are comparable across modules within the Course at each respective level. The modules and the academic level attained are equivalent to those achieved on similar courses at other universities in the UK.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

The academic standard achieved accords with the learning outcomes specified for each module. The academic standards achieved by the students are appropriate for each of the modules, are at a level appropriate for the modules. The assignments and examinations provide evidence that the learning outcomes are being achieved and the results achieved are appropriate for the modules and the course of study.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

The body of work produced by students is appropriate and of good quality and provides a sound demonstration of the student learning achieved on the modules. The quality of work produced is generally good, with examples of very good work, but it also reflects the range of performance produced by students' of differing abilities within the cohort. The range of results is as expected for a cohort of this size.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

The learning and teaching methods are appropriate for the subjects studied and have produced good results by the students involved. There is evidence of good practice across the modules examined.

Support of student learning has been effective, which is reflected in the quality of work produced and the results achieved. The feedback provided to students in relation to the written assignments is especially good, it is comprehensive, structured and sufficiently extensive to provide clear guidance and feedback to enable students to understand their performance and to develop their abilities further. Conversations with students confirmed that support is accessible to students when required and is regarded by students to be timely and of good quality. Students were very positive regarding the support provided by staff across all modules on the course.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

The assessments that were set for each module address the learning outcomes and test the subject matter, scope and contents of the curriculum. They provide students with the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and skills in each of the respective modules, assessments enabled the performance of individual students to be clearly distinguished. The assessments were appropriate for the subject and were set at an appropriate level for each respective module. Assessments provided students with all the information they required to identify what is expected by the assignment and the criteria against which it will be assessed.

Marking is accurate, appropriately stringent and consistent for each assessment.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

The provision of information for assignments continues to be very good, it is comprehensive and clearly set out, it provides students with all the information they require in relation to what is expected by the assignment and the criteria against which it will be assessed.

The feedback provided to students is also very good, providing comprehensive, structured and well-focused feedback on their performance, together with how their performance could be improved.

7) Recommendations Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.
None

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
------------	-----------	-----------

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

a. Programme Handbook(s)	Yes		
b. Academic Regulations	Yes		
c. Module Descriptors	Yes		
d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria	Yes		

Draft Examination Papers

a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)	Yes		
b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?	Yes		
c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	Yes		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)	Yes		
b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?	Yes		
c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?	Yes		

Dissertations/Project reports

a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?	Yes		
---	-----	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	
Modules only	x

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

BSV09107 Construction Economics 2
BSV09115 Construction Economics 3
BSV10108 Construction Economics 4
BSV10111 Dissertation

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BSc (Hons) Quantity Surveying

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	x	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	x	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	x	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	x	

Section C:

<p>1) Comparability Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.</p>
<p>I found appropriate comparability. There is evidence of improving knowledge, understanding and academic maturity between the different levels on the programme.</p>
<p>2) Commentary on Academic issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the subject benchmark statements and SCQF level descriptors</p>
<p>The academic standards are appropriate. Consistent with the sector, there is always the possibility to improve 'citing in text' and references. The students are clearly shown how to do it correctly.</p>
<p>3) Student Performance Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content</p>
<p>The quality of student work was very good. There are many examples of students citing high quality academic publications. In the work I looked at, I did not see many citations from industry journals; that may have just been my sampling. I am happy to let tutors reflect on this issue, as my observation may not be well-founded.</p> <p>Students select a good range of relevant issues for their choice of research in dissertations. They are proactive in getting their data.</p>
<p>4) Learning and Teaching Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes</p>
<p>Tutors are using guest speakers to support delivery. The quality of the texts and other material used for learning are appropriate.</p>

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

I found the assessments challenging. They were very carefully set, and always evidence of internal moderation. I was asked in good time to provide feedback on assessments.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

Students were given excellent feedback in their assessments.

The 'module boxes' available for my perusal as an External Examiner were excellent. There was always evidence of second marking. Reasons were given in examinations scripts about why high or low marks were awarded; there were clear marking schemes.

I noted one dissertation where the internal examiners 'wrestled' with the possibility of a pass or fail grade. Their final decision was to pass; I support that judgement.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

In the dissertations, there may be the possibility for more rigorous analysis. The candidate in one of the documents I read, reflected on whether to undertake just descriptive statistical analysis or to try some inferential work. Whilst the quality of data collected was appropriate for inferential, the selection was for the simpler descriptive method. The University may wish to advise candidates, that if they are able to use the more rigorous analytical tools (quantitative or qualitative), they may be awarded (provided the rest of the research holds together well), more marks.

Before my first visit to the University in January 2014, I browsed the University web site; to try to learn some more about the School of Engineering and the Built Environment. I was able to find the School easily from the University home page, and thereafter about courses. However, I thought the School under-sells itself a little; very little about research and cannot find any staff. As an employer, student, or external guest I might want more information; and particularly as a parent I might want more before thinking about sending my off-spring to Napier? I do not find this uncommon at other Universities.

I observed that I found it 'odd', to have responsibility for just four modules on the programme. This was discussed and explained at the Examination Board in January 2014. I accept the outcomes of those discussions.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

X		
X		
X		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		
X		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the

X		
		X

opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

x		
x		
		X First report

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Arrangements for and conduct of Examination Boards was excellent. I was always received warmly; thank you. I attended the External Examiner Induction day on 28.04.14. I found that very useful.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	X
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers

(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

1. Module BSV 09103 Quantity Surveying 2
2. Module BSV 09111 Contract Administration and Practice

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BSC [Hons] Quantity Surveying

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?	Yes	
Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?	Yes	
Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?	Yes	
Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?	Yes*	

* I would note that my experience of other institutions is very restricted given my professional background. I would however refer back to my experience from the last academic year and suggest that this year's students have equalled and actually surpassed the standards I previously assessed.

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The coursework between modules was generally of a similar (high) standard.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the subject benchmark statements and SCQF level descriptors

Yes

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

As mentioned earlier this appeared to be an exceptional year in terms of quality of work produced by the students.

In the lower marked work, it certainly came across that there was an almost disinterest in the course as I could easily detect a complete lack of effort. This was in both the writing and the apparent lack of research into some of the topics. Thankfully however these were very much in the minority.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

The strengths in the course content at Napier is that it is completely relevant and applicable to what the students will encounter in the professional arena. Whilst University is in no way a “training ground” for new QS candidates, I am encouraged that the students are being provided with the right tools to begin their careers. This includes elements such as report writing, technical language, real life and complex scenarios to deal with and working as part of a team such as the multi-disciplinary project that the students undertake in their final year.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

I consider that the marking across both modules was consistent and above all, fair. Feedback was given and in some instances where the submissions were pretty poor, the patience and ability to seek out correct answers was commendable. I’m confident that each student was given as good a chance as possible to do well in this course.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

I’d perhaps expand on the multi-disciplinary team project, which I think is an excellent concept. This really helps the students to mature and recognises that enthusiasm, working with people and management are just as critical as academic ability. They needed to excel in all of these fields to obtain a good mark, and this will set them up for beyond University.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

Strangely I’d probably single out the above project in terms of how it is marked. I’d have a concern that students could be carried by others or conversely, outstanding students brought down by others less inclined.

--

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

		NA
		NA
		NA

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Dissertations/Project reports

a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

Yes		
-----	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

a. Were you able to attend the meeting?

Yes		
-----	--	--

b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

--	--	--

c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?

Yes		
-----	--	--

d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

Yes		
-----	--	--

e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

Yes		
-----	--	--

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	X
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers

(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

CTR09115 Freight Transport
 CTR09118 Introduction to Transport Policy
 CTR09127 Transport Psychology
 CTR09128 Transport Development Management
 CTR10119 Public Transport
 CTR10120 Transport Appraisal
 CTR10122 Honours Project
 CTR10128 Railway Planning and Operations

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BSc Transport Management

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	X	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	X	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	X	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	X	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

There is a high level of comparability between the modules on the course, with all of the modules I considered offering the strongest students appropriate opportunities to get high marks. The fact that many of the students do not have English as a native language has some impact on the standard of student work but, even here, the students are treated fairly based on their knowledge and ability to get their points across. The standard of student work is similar to that at other institutions.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Yes, I certainly believe so. The course team is well qualified to deliver the programme to the appropriate standards. The overall programme offers students a rounded understanding of contemporary transport management issues, covering both “hard” and “soft” topics.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

A number of students seem to struggle with detail and, as a consequence, produce fairly superficial work that demonstrates some (but not a lot of) understanding. It is reassuring to see some very strong student work as well though. Some students didn't write very much in their exams, so there was not a lot of material for the markers to work from – this seems to relate to the English language issue raised in 1).

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

There is a good range of teaching and assessment techniques, helping students to develop the transferable skills desired by employers together with a detailed knowledge of transport management topics.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

The assessment process in terms of setting and marking coursework and exams, is certainly rigorous. From talking with the course team and looking through samples of marked work, I am satisfied that the feedback process is of a good standard.

The decisions taken both at module and programme level reflect the commitment of the course team to ensuring rigorous and fair assessment.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

Small group of students means that the course team has a good understanding of each student's performance across the course. There is a high level of attention to detail at both the module and programme boards, ensuring that consistent decisions are made and all students are treated fairly.

Feedback to students in CTR09128 Transport Development Management is particularly good, with detailed and structured coursework feedback given. For some other modules, it is less easy to determine the feedback provided to students.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

It would be nice to see the coursework feedback for CTR09128 used as a template for the other modules.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

	X	
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

X		
X		
X		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		
X		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the

X (two)		
X (for Jan		

opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

board)		
X		
X		
		X

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programme and Modules	√
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

ELE09108 Individual Project

ELE 10108 Honours Project

MEC09103 Advanced CAD

MEC09104 Materials and Manufacture 2

MEC09108 Design and Development 2

MEC09130 Engineering Design 2 (*)

(*) This module is replaced by ELE09108 Individual Project for students intending to exit at BSc degree level

MEC10100 Sustainable Design

MEC10111 Future Technologies and Design

I was also assigned:

MEC09101 Materials for Product Manufacture (Distance Learning)?

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BSc(Hons) Product Design Engineering F/T

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	√	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	√	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	√	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	√	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The QAA Part A: Setting and maintaining threshold academic standards document states that, "The Scottish Bachelors degree with Honours is typically offered through the equivalent of four years of full-time higher education.....All Honours degrees will exhibit a balance of breadth and depth as will be clear from particular programme specifications". The BSc (Hons) PDE is in keeping with those statements. I attended the Module Board of Examiners ELE and MEC Subject Groups - Levels 7 - 11 and saw evidence of a thorough and robust process for maintaining such standards. I have had the opportunity to see samples of work, examinations (pre/post delivery) and marks with feedback and the standard across modules appears at an appropriate level and comparable with other HEIs.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

The modules I have examined all meet the threshold academic standards as set. The level 10 Honours Project, as delivered, epitomises many of the outcome descriptors: i.e.
 Knowledge that covers and integrates most of the principal areas, features, boundaries, terminology and conventions of product design engineering;
 A critical understanding of the principal theories, concepts and principles;
 Detailed knowledge and understanding in one or more specialisms, some of which is informed by product design engineering;
 Knowledge and understanding of the ways in which product design engineering is developed, including a range of established techniques of enquiry or research methodologies.
 The emphasis on a good defence of the Honours Project, as observed through my attendance at the Project Vivas, was robust and rigorous and indicative of a determination to maintain standards.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

As with most cohorts individual strengths and weaknesses vary. MEC09118 Management for Engineers 2 (a module I am not assigned to examine) does appear to highlight a relative weakness even for the best BSc PDE performers and it would be interesting to compare the performance of the PDE students against other programmes. It would be interesting to look at PDE student performance in MEC10118 Advanced Processes and Digital Manufacture (a PDE module that I am not External Examiner for) alongside the other final year PDE modules.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

There is evidence of a wide range of teaching and learning methods across the programme and these appear appropriate to the content and disciplines involved in the specific modules.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

There is evidence of due process for the award of just and fair grades. There are variations in feedback content and style, but much of that may be appropriate to module and assignment content. At the module board, staff showed concerns for those students who struggle to fully engage and keen to discuss any new methods to identify and deal with this. A 1st class grade is well earned on the BSc PDE programme.

6) Good practice Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight
<p>The Honours Project approach to the viva, requiring the students to answer challenging questions (staff had looked at the submission to identify these questions), after a short optional summary, appeared to be very good practice. This allowed probing and the opportunity for the brilliant performers to shine as well as identifying areas of concern and providing an opportunity to defend.</p>
7) Recommendations Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.
<p>“There did appear to be an issue raised by both students and staff regarding access to resources for project work. As I understand it there are informal arrangements whereby PDE students are able to access a resource at times when the primary users do not require it. Given that good time management is a desirable trait in graduating students, it would be good to formalise availability.” Report 2012/13</p> <p>This issue raised in my previous report does not appear to have been addressed? Indeed access to resources for project work is a reoccurring theme for this report.</p> <p>Draft exam papers did generally arrive with more time for me to consider and comment this academic year – Thank you for that response.</p>

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
------------	-----------	-----------

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

		√
√		
√		
√		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer ‘NA’ if you did not because it was at your request)

√		
---	--	--

b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?

√		
√		

c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)

√		
√		
√		

b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?

c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

Dissertations/Project reports

a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

√		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

a. Were you able to attend the meeting?

b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?

d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

	√	
√*		
		√
√		
	√	

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

The BSc (Hons) PDE programme, as delivered, fully justifies it's accreditation by the Institution of Engineering Designers (IED) on behalf of the Engineering Council for the purposes of fully meeting the academic requirement for registration as an Incorporated Engineer.

* post-meeting



Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at
Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	X
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers

(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

BSV10106 Planning & Development 3
 BSV09104 Development Appraisal
 BSV09112 Investment Appraisal
 BSV09116 Valuation 2
 BSV10111 Dissertation
 BSV09118 Planning & Development 3

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

BSc(Hons) Property Development & Valuation

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	X	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	X	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	X	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	X	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

Standards of work are generally consistent between modules with students demonstrating appropriate levels of knowledge. Where there are any discrepancies (between students) this often comes from the more analytical or presentations skills based elements.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

I would consider that the academic standard of each module and the overall programme is set and maintained the appropriate level and meets the required threshold and benchmark standards.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

As mentioned in point 1) above students are generally strong in the more technical subject specific elements of the course with less consistency in the analytical and presentation based elements of reports. This may be a reflection on the experience and background of students.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

All modules utilise a variety of methods which improve effectiveness of learning and teaching. In addition to lectures and tutorials there seems to be good use of external / industry contacts for guest lectures which can help engagement and understanding of a topic.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

Assessment and feedback across all modules appears to be consistent and fair with appropriate processes in place to ensure standards are consistently applied.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

Contacts with industry are strong and this will enhance research as well as feeding through to lectures and tutorials to bring some current industry practice to students which will enhance the academic elements.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

No specific recommendations

--

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
------------	-----------	-----------

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

x		
x		
x		
x		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

x		
x		
x		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

x		
x		
x		

Dissertations/Project reports

a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

x		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

a. Were you able to attend the meeting?

x		
---	--	--

b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

		x
--	--	---

c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?

x		
---	--	--

d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

x		
---	--	--

e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

x		
---	--	--

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

No further comments

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	X
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

All Modules appertaining to Mechanical Suite Levels 7, 8, 9, 10

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

Mechanical Suite Levels 7, 8, 9, 10

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	X	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	X	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	X	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	X	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The spread of results indicate that teaching, learning and assessment are pitched at the appropriate level and there are no causes for concern. I have had sight of the fullest range of work and I can clearly see that where there has been failure by the individual candidate's this outcome has been achieved by their failure to engage with a particular module and/or assessment. I believe the standards are comparable with other Institutions with which I am familiar.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

The knowledge of the academic staff of individual students indicates a profound commitment to their mentoring duties and is to be commended. The structure, intent, design, dimension and implementation of assessment over the programmes follow characteristic UK paramount practice and are entirely appropriate. I have found the marking to be consistent, dependable and just and internal moderation is to an excellent standard. The assessment methods are appropriate to gauge the learning outcomes and also to allow for discrimination between student groups and individuals.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

This year the student performance has again been by and large high-quality in the final years and as is frequently the case in similar courses, the students who are occupied with industrial activity greatly gain from this experience. Their maturity of approach to their studies subsequently is considerable when compared with those who for a variety of reasons are unable to benefit from this experience. I judge the quality of the final year project work to be commendable and this is an excellent example/demonstration of the knowledge and skills acquired by the students as they proceed through their course of study.

I believe there are no weaknesses which I can identify. I have been particularly

impressed by the exemplary standard of the project work, which is very much at a full industrial/professional level, and is a good indicator for the type of work the students may be expected to undertake once they are in employment.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

I am satisfied that the curriculum is up to date and this is attested to by the enthusiasm of industry all over the country to connect with the school. As ever, in comparable institutions, learning resources are always stretched but I have been very pleased to see the developments in the underpinning the areas. I am impressed by the additions to facilities since my previous visits when a good deal of commissioning was yet to be completed.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

The structure, design and execution of the schemes follow typical UK best practice and are entirely appropriate. The standards are comparable with other Institutions with which I am familiar. I have found the marking to be consistent and fair and internal moderation is to a high standard. I believe the modes of assessment (coursework, examination, etc) are appropriate for the programme/module assessments.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

I was entirely at ease with the conduct of the Module and Programme Boards and clear that the University Regulations were fully observed. Further, I am also content that all candidates were considered justly and with equity. The administrative arrangements were excellent as was the chairmanship of the Board and the staff concerned are to be highly praised for their professionalism and careful contributions to the proceedings.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

I have no advice or recommendations as I am content with the current arrangements.

I have one observation that the Computer System which is used to present the results appears, particularly, to have difficulty in presenting the profile of those students who are enrolled on the MEng pathway accurately - leading to the need for considerable "manual" intervention. Perhaps the system could be better configured to remedy this matter?

--

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

X		
X		
X		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		
X		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting? **3 Meetings Attended**

X		
---	--	--

- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

		X
X		
X		
X		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

I judge the quality of the Final Year project work to be exemplary and this is an excellent example/manifestation of the understanding and skills obtained by the students who pursue these programmes of study.

The Accreditation for the MEng/BEng degrees is a particular and distinctive strength.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	X
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

Forensic Engineering (CTR11100)

Foundation Design to Eurocode 7 (CTR11101)

Structural Dynamics and Earthquake Design (CTR11102)

Advanced Mechanics of Materials and Finite Element Analysis (CTR11107)

MSc Dissertation (CTR11111)

Advanced Structural Concrete (CTR11118)

Advanced Structural Steelwork Design (CTR11119)

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

MSc Advanced Structural Engineering

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	X	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	X	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	X	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	X	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

A range of different subjects / topics are covered both within and between the modules studied on the programme. I believe the standards of student work between modules are appropriate and comparable with those of similar higher education institutions, with which I am familiar.

The programme is accredited by the appropriate Engineering Institutions, meeting the requirements for further learning at CEng Level for candidates with an appropriate BEng qualification.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Based on the material considered, including coursework briefs, exam papers, and the associated submissions / scripts, and discussions with staff and students taking the programme, the academic standards appear to be set and maintained at the appropriate level (corresponding to SCQF Level 11) for students taking a MSc.

While analysis and design coursework and exam papers require students to demonstrate knowledge and understanding through calculations, there could be a better balance between these and discussion type questions, in some cases.

Exam papers are taken in at the end of exams. As a result, in some cases papers are not changed between years and exam diets. Given exam questions are likely to reflect only part of the material covered in modules (and that students re-sitting exams will see questions twice), efforts to include different questions should be made.

The research project and dissertation part gives students the opportunity to carry out work in a range of different areas. The scope of the projects on offer is appropriate.

The outcomes of the coursework, exams and dissertations reflects the ability, or not, of students to meet the required level set. Students are given sufficient opportunities to achieve this, with re-sitting of exams / re-submission of dissertations allowed.

Students successfully completing module / dissertation parts of the programme are awarded their MSc. Those attaining a high level of performance in both, achieve this with distinction.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

There are two intakes for the programme, September and January and it is also possible to take this full or part-time. At a given time, students can therefore be at different stages of their studies.

Of the 6 modules taken by between 19 and 22 students for tri-mesters 1 and 2 in 2013/14, there were between 2 and 8 fails on each. For most of the modules there were between 5/6 fails. In

general, students not passing all modules had multiple fails. There appeared to be a slightly higher failure rate this year than last. The modules that students fail tend to vary from year to year and don't appear to be in specific subject areas.

I reviewed eight dissertations during 2013/14. These covered a range of different project types, including experimental, design-based and literature review. The quality of these was variable. Issues including making a case for the work, criticality in literature evaluation, justification for methodology and interpretation of data could have been better in some cases and were where marks tended to be lost.

As noted with the performance in the modules, that in the dissertations did not appear to correspond to the subject area or project type.

From the material considered, students not passing modules or dissertations was the result of a lack of completeness, technical knowledge / understanding (including ability to apply these) and analysis, or clarity in reporting.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

A range of teaching methods are used, depending on the type of material covered in the particular modules. These include laboratory classes, computer laboratories, lectures, tutorials and directed study tasks, and contribute to a good learning experience.

Research interests of staff feed into modules, where possible, and there also appears to be international dimensions and industrial input (as mentioned in module descriptors).

The coursework (including, structural analysis and design, research and laboratory activities) and exam papers set, covered a good range of topics within each of the modules.

My review of submitted coursework and exam scripts indicates that the topics and teaching were adequate to meet the required level set.

Dissertation work was carried out under the supervision of individual members of staff in their areas of interest. Having spoken to staff, the supervision and methods of working during the dissertation stage were appropriate and similar to those followed at other institutions. It was noted that some students may work remotely from the institution during this stage, which can introduce difficulties to the process.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

Assessment of the programme is made from coursework submissions, written exams or a combination of these (with exams normally representing the main component of combinations). The project for the dissertation work, normally issued during the second tri-mester and submitted at the end of the third tri-mester, is also considered.

I reviewed a selection of the above completed items during the year, sent to me prior to Programme Board Meetings.

The courseworks seemed to be appropriately assessed and I generally agreed with the ranking for those considered.

Feedback to students on coursework, as noted previously, is variable. Marking schemes are provided for some submissions, with comments ranging from very detailed to brief.

There are differences in exam papers between modules, with some giving a choice of questions and open book, and others giving no choice and closed book. Solutions were in the main very good and it was possible to see where marks and credit were given. In general, breakdown of marks in exam scripts was provided. Signs of internal moderation / checking of these were apparent in some cases.

Dissertations are assessed by two members of staff including the project supervisor. A third member of staff becomes involved if there is a significant difference in initial marks. In those I reviewed, where the two assessments were provided, there appeared to be agreement between markers. My assessment also generally corresponded to that carried out internally.

I met / had discussions with two of the students taking the programme, during my visit for the Programme Board Meeting in June. They were generally supportive of the programme and staff involved in its delivery.

Module leaders gave written responses with regard to how they had dealt with my comments on exam papers, made during the first and second tri-mesters. These were satisfactory.

I attended two Civil Engineering Postgraduate Programme Board Meetings in June and September 2014. The meetings were conducted in a professional manner, with the marks carefully reviewed and appropriate discussions held with regard to individual students.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

Practices followed in the running of the programme are similar to those that I am aware of at other institutions.

I found the overall administration of the programme to be good, with advanced notice provided about the review of coursework / exam papers and students' work, and a quick response to any queries raised.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

As indicated in the above sections, I am generally satisfied with the MSc programme and would make the following suggestions,

I think in some cases (structural analysis and design modules) further efforts to put questions in coursework / exam papers in a practical context and to ask students to discuss or give views on technical matters could be made.

In some cases, efforts should be made to change questions in exam papers between academic years and exam diets.

A clearer indication of where marks are awarded in coursework and exam scripts could be provided in some cases.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

X		
Mainly		
X		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		
Mainly		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?

X		
---	--	--

b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?

d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

		NA
X		
X		
Mainly		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

NA

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	X
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers

(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

BSV11132 Building Performance 1, BSV11134 Building Performance 3, BSV11131 Advanced Digital Media, BSV 11130 Dissertation Project

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

MSc Architectural Technology and Building Performance

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	Yes	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	Yes	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	Yes	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	Yes	

Section C:

<p>1) Comparability Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.</p>
<p>Academic standards have been maintained and are still deemed appropriate for this level of study</p>
<p>2) Commentary on Academic issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the subject benchmark statements and SCQF level descriptors</p>
<p>Academic standards are suitably challenging, demanding a range of skills across the subject areas. These include independent research and reportage, numerical calculation and the demonstration of design and communication skills. There is a good balance between the demonstration of vocational skills and academic knowledge.</p>
<p>3) Student Performance Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content</p>
<p>Student performance is generally good with individual effort rather than prior knowledge distinguishing the level of attainment. All students who complete are capable of demonstrating good performance and ability to meet the relevant learning outcomes</p>
<p>4) Learning and Teaching Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes</p>
<p>Feedback from students indicates a high degree of confidence in the learning environment and satisfaction with the delivery of modules.</p>
<p>5) Assessment Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes</p>

Students obviously benefit from easy access and a high degree of contact with the teaching staff. The provision and quality of feedback is exemplary. The marking is consistent and fair.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

For a course that has a vocational ethos the use of real world contexts for coursework can be seen to be beneficial. Equally the employment of practitioners in the design studio maintains a high level of relevance and provides real world contemporary applicability.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

No further recommendations at this time.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

	No	
	No	
Yes		
Yes		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

Yes		
-----	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Given that this is the final report within my term of office I can report that I was continually impressed by the standards of organisation and professionalism displayed by all members of staff – both academic and administrative. At the module and progression boards the standard of information and the conduct of the boards demonstrated fairness and equality and were conducted with admirable efficiency.

I hope that the course continues to be supported as it delivers a well rounded education that the students – and would expect future employers – will find of value.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate		
Programmes and Modules X	MSc Automation and Control; MSC Mechanical Eng; MSc Renewable Energy; MSc Energy and Environmental Engineering		
	ELE11109	MSc Project	TR1/2/3
	MEC11101	Control Engineering	TR2
	MEC11102	Design Analysis	TR2
	MEC11104	Mechanical Computer Aided Engineering	TR2
	MEC11107	Automation and Robotics	TR1
	MEC11114	Mechatronic Systems	TR2
	MEC11121	Solar Energy: Technology, Modelling and Analysis	TR1
	MEC11122	Renewable Energy Finance and Environmental Law	TR1
	MEC11123	Sustainable Energy Technologies	TR1
	MEC11124	Design and Quality Management	TR2
	MEC11524	Design and Quality Management (replacement for MEC11503)	TR1
Modules only			

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

MSc Automation and Control;

MSC Mechanical Eng;

MSc Renewable Energy;

MSc Energy and Environmental Engineering

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	yes	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	yes	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	yes	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	yes	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The standard of modules is comparable with that of MSc Modules at Brunel University. I have for example experience of MSc in Engineering Design and MSc in Integrated Product Design as well as at Loughborough University MEng in Product Design and manufacture.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

The Engineering Subject area within Engineering and The Built Environment Faculty is maintaining appropriate academic standards. I have studied work of a wide range of types and had discussions assessment with the academic staff involved. The academic standard of the work is of an appropriate standard and students have to meet the learning outcomes in order to achieve success. I have been particularly impressed with the work demonstrated in the project reports. This work requires analysis of topics covered in specific modules and synthesis of a set of coherent outcomes.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

In modules students are required to understand theoretical topics which are often applied to practical situations thus demonstrating a practical engineering approach.

Many of the students have difficulty with the English language, sometimes making portions of the text difficult to follow. It should be emphasised that a successful report must be clear and concise.

I earlier reported that some students, when reporting on wide ranging issues such those concerned with environmental problems have a tendency to adopt a less rigorous approach. Recent work has shown less evidence of this.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

Appropriate and varied methods for learning and teaching are used throughout; these methods vary from module to module. The assessment methods were appropriate for the module content and for the student learning experience.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

I was able to influence the examination papers and coursework assignments and to consider their relationships to assessment criteria. The proposed assessments were sent in advance in advance allowing me to judge them for rigour and fairness, and my comments were forwarded to the module leader. I was also able to observe the outcome of assessments .

Then by studying the coursework and examination scripts I was able to observe careful marking. In most cases there was clear indication of the way in which the marks were awarded or lost. I have pointed out that this is helpful to external examiners and others.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

The examples of project reports included a range from the lower grades through to distinctions. This process enables an external examiner to assess the culmination of learning from the programme.

The range of projects reported on was impressive including the identification of real technical problems; modelling the system and simulating solutions. The simulation might include laboratory mock-ups or computer modelling. Other projects often dealt with issues local to Scotland or local to the student's home.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

I would ask that every effort is made to provide documents to external examiners as early as possible. Sometimes there is little time for discussion between the material arriving for comment and the need for it to be given to students or examination board.

It would be helpful if visits to Napier University and the transmission of work could be organised and overseen by one member of administrative staff.

I am pleased that earlier comments have been accepted and appropriate responses made.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
------------	-----------	-----------

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

Yes		
------------	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

Yes		

- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	Yes
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent,
please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

Electrical Engineering

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	X	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	X	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	X	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	X	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

I have been an External Examiner on a number of Masters programmes in this country and overseas, providing a breadth of experience on which to call to make such a judgement.

As a result, I have a good familiarity with a number of Masters programmes elsewhere and indeed at my own University (where I have been responsible for developing a number of programmes).

A high standard of question-setting in any such Masters programme is to be expected and what I see here is that this programme achieves the standards of questions to challenge the students in different ways.

I have examined when visiting, a number of scripts and am satisfied that from that evidence there is good compatibility in the standards of student work with other educational institutions in the answering of the questions set.

Marking standards are good - the scripts I have examined are accurately marked with a clear indication of marks per section and totalled correctly, with the second marker's confirmation of the original mark evident from the script.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

What I can see and what I have examined during my visits show that the academic standards of the modules and thus the programme of study under consideration are set and subsequently maintained by the staff involved at an appropriate level.

The modules forming the programme meet at least the threshold academic standards expected of such modules forming this programme, from the evidence available to me.

I am satisfied that the material underpinning the programme meets the required external quality and subject benchmark standards.

As is usual, the content of some of the modules of the programme is under review and that I encourage: some modules are taken by small numbers of students and although their academic standards are fully satisfactory, this may be the time to replace them with alternative material of similar standard. This should be considered on an annual basis, as is being done, to 'refresh' the material and make the best of any new staff expertise.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

The material taught and the assessments made provide, in my view from what is presented to me, evidence that the top cohort of students are achieving well and have the opportunity to demonstrate their talents and abilities to the full.

A satisfactory range of student performance in the examinations is seen, with poor marks for a weak performance and good marks for the best, showing the range is well used in all assessments. This shows the strengths of the top end of the cohort and allows for compensation when permitted for the weaknesses of the lower end.

At the lower end of the spectrum, students can demonstrate the minimum required level of achievement and pass. There is a very high level of flexibility for students to retake and to be reassessed and thus the approach taken is certainly fair – it gives students every opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and skills and students should be satisfied with this.

It is clear that staff know the students and their situations well and make every effort to help and support, especially in the case of academic weakness or extenuating or difficult circumstances. This is good and shows the quality of the support given.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

The learning and teaching methods used are both appropriate and diverse – indeed what is needed for an engineering programme and following best practice and the recommendations of professional bodies in the field.

Thus students are taught and learn in a variety of ways. This is good practice for engineers and the effectiveness of this is demonstrated in the assessments, be they conventional examinations, laboratory practice, coursework or other assessments carried out.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

The assessment methods used seem very fair and reasonable, allowing the better students to demonstrate the breadth of their knowledge and enabling weaker students to obtain either a satisfactory mark and pass or to be reassessed at a future date and there are many opportunities for such reassessment. The students will have no cause for complaint or lack of fairness in the number of opportunities to be reassessed – the opportunities for such reassessment are plentiful.

The assessments are rigorous and thorough as would be expected of an engineering programme of this type.

<p>6) Good practice</p> <p>Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight</p> <p>Good practice is seen in various ways – in its design and operation of the programme and in the variety of assessment methods used. This enables students to demonstrate a range of skills, both practical and theoretical and to be assessed fairly and demonstrate their skills.</p> <p>The quality of the marking process, including the role of the second marker is to be commended.</p>
<p>7) Recommendations</p> <p>Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.</p> <p>I have no specific recommendations to make. Students are treated fairly and well when they participate in the programme.</p> <p>As I have discussed the programme is well structured and the assessments are fair, indeed in some cases generous to students who perform at a level close to threshold. Assessment is fair and accurate.</p> <p>I made the following comment last year and received the expected response. However I will make it again as I consider it relevant. The use of non-numerical grades for the assessment is, as I know, a cross-University policy that has been adopted for some years. However it does not, in my view, aid the process of assessment and makes more opaque the combination of 'marks' for different parts of an overall assessment. I would suggest that the University review this policy – it is not in my view widely used elsewhere and in my view detracts from the assessment process.</p>

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
------------	-----------	-----------

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

X		
X		
X		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		
X		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meetings?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

X Mostly		
X		
X		
X		
X See comment on Section 7 above		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

In my view, the programme meets the standards set by the relevant professional bodies for engineering. I comment as having been an assessor for one of the Engineering Council Accrediting Bodies at another institution.

I commend the staff for the thoroughness of their approach and for the interest they take and demonstrate in the students and their work and circumstances

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Section A: Personal Details

(This section will be removed before the report is published on our website)

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	✓
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

BSV11120 Dissertation

BSV11123 Integrated Management Systems

BSV11124 Waste Management

BSV11125 Sustainable Urban Property Development

BSV11126 Sustainable Water Resource Management

BSV 11121 Health and Safety Law

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

MSc Environmental Sustainability

MSc Safety and Environmental Management

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	✓	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	✓	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	✓	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	✓	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The standards of student work at SCQF Level 11 are appropriately set and comparable with other HE institutions that I am familiar with. There is a good mix of examination and coursework; with coursework feedback providing students with the opportunity to enhance their performance between coursework and examinations.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Yes in general. However, care needs to be taken in a number of courses to ensure that examinations are set to appropriately test the rigour and understanding of student performance, by demonstrating their ability to apply knowledge and give examples and application of understanding. There were a few exams in 2013-14 which tested the students on their knowledge and ability to list or comment; rather than analyse, apply and demonstrate. This is the critical difference between masters level (SCQF Level 11) performance and lower UG levels. If students are asked to list or comment, then the marking allocated to these tasks should be suitable low, with further questions added to test understanding, application and demonstration.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

Marking seemed to be at an appropriate level for the work submitted. Perhaps a clear demonstration of the type of work which would attract higher marks (>75%) may encourage some of the better students to apply their scholarly skills to reach these higher grades with independent research and resource finding of their own? E.g. open questions which allow more able students to demonstrate their wider reading.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

I would like the opportunity at future boards to be able to speak to the teaching team about their approaches to teaching and assessment, what site visits, visiting speakers and industry input there may be. Time was very tight at the last board day.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

The criteria for assessment appear to be well set-out and fairly applied. The marking schedule was made available in the coursework briefs I reviewed.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

The coursework briefs appear to adopt a uniform approach across the programme, detailing to the students what is required, when the assessment is due, and what the marking criteria used will be.

The boards are to be commended on their smooth running and the information made available to all staff and externals at the board. Good to see this is done almost paperlessly and certainly with efficiency.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

The main recommendations concerns two aspects of examination preparation. These are as follows:

- 1. Examination questions should ask just one question at a time. There were several instances where several questions are asked within one sentence, with no split of marks or allocation. Questions should be more straightforward and show the split of marking allocations.**
- 2. At SCQF Level 11 it is insufficient to ask questions which simply test**

student ability to remember information and regurgitate. Questions should be asked which demand that the students critically evaluate; appraise; compare and contrast; justify with reasons; provide examples of; or demonstrate understanding of.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

✓		
✓		
✓		
✓		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

✓		
	✓	
✓		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

✓		
✓		
✓		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

✓		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

✓		
✓		
✓		
		✓

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

A good first year – I look forward to working with the programme team managers in the coming years. Thank you.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

This report is for: **modules & programmes/ modules/programmes**

Insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers:

TM

BSV11112 Facilities Management 1

BSV11113 Facilities Management 2

BSV11100 Strategic Management (Built Env and Engineering)

BSV11120 Dissertation

Insert the programme title to which this report refers:

52701MM MSc Facilities Management F/T

52702MM MSc Facilities Management P/T

52703MM Msc Facilities Management D/L

59204MM Msc Facilities Management D/L

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	x	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	x	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	x	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	x	

If you answered no to any of the questions please provide details in section C as appropriate.

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The content and make-up of the modules are comparable with other courses in the UK and across other courses at Napier of which I have experience

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?

Yes. I have been provided with full access to module content and development and I am satisfied that these have been set and maintained at the appropriate level

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

Highly satisfactory standards have been achieved by students across the modules and the dissertations that I have assessed. I have no concerns.

4) Learning and Teaching Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes
Highly effective. Staff are innovative and enthusiastic in learning and teaching development
5) Assessment Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes
Staff take assessment very seriously. The fairness and rigour applied across the assessment and feedback has been consistent and has been well executed.
6) Good practice Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight
Course content continues to be topical, relevant and timely.
7) Recommendations Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.
None

--

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

x		
x		
x		
x		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

x		
x		
x		

Marking Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

x		
x		
x		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

x		
---	--	--

Coursework/Continuously Assessed Work

- a. Was sufficient coursework made available to you for assessment?

x		
---	--	--

- b. Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?

x		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

x		
		x
x		
x		
		x

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to eereports@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	√
Modules only	√

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers
(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

Project Management;
Project Appraisal and Finance;
Production management;
Procurement Strategy;
Project Risk Management;
Dissertation

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

MSc Property & Construction Management;
MSc Construction Project Management

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	X	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	X	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	X	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	X	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The assessments set are generally very challenging, even for PG level. Both the assessment briefs and exam papers are well considered and cover a wide ranging variety of themes within the overall subjects of the MSc programmes.

The standard of the dissertations is high and I agree with the marks that were awarded. In the sample that I was sent, the use of some advanced statistical data analysis is evident which is good to see at PGT level.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Yes- all of the assessments are clearly set at the correct level and the work produced, if marked at a pass, is definitely at the correct standard and comparable to the work produced at other UK HEIs. Some of the work, especially the dissertations, that have been given higher marks are of an excellent standard. Where work is of a lower quality, the marks awarded accurately reflect that.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

On a couple of modules there was some poor performance by the students but this was discussed prior to the assessment board. The problem was the students' lack of engagement with some of the modules as opposed to the teaching or the assessments that were set.

Students who had engaged, had produced good quality work

The programme team discussed plans to re-engage some of the students who had performed poorly, which is to be commended.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

Although I have not been witness to any of the teaching of the programmes/modules, it is evident that the teaching approaches adopted and the learning effected by the students is good, if the students engage.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

I agreed with the marks awarded for all the assessments I reviewed. Good detailed feedback was generally given, especially for the dissertations which had been second and in some cases third marked. All the markers gave full detailed feedback in this module.

It was good to see the use of a full range of marks, especially in Project Appraisal and Finance with a range of 12-83%.

I understand that Napier do not have a policy for double marking work except for the dissertations, but some marks seem to be amended on the cover sheets of exams. It would be useful to understand the process of moderation more fully and I will explore this during my next visit.

In the second coursework for the Project Management module the students produced some excellent work which is to be commended.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

The use of histograms to clearly demonstrate the spread of marks is very useful to an External Examiners.

Basically, the quality of the work demonstrates evidence of good practice in all aspects teaching, learning and assessment

The efficiency of the administrative team in sending all the assessment to me in plenty of time to review.

The openness and honesty of the programme team in discussing the issues of non-participation by some students

<p>7) Recommendations Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.</p>
<p>It would be beneficial to the programme team if they could be assisted in undertaking some research to determine the reasons why some students have not engaged fully with the programme. If possible mechanisms could then be developed to try to resolve this issue. I am however aware that this may have been a problem with this cohort only, and as it is my first year as External Examiner I will monitor this over the next few years.</p>

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?

X		
X		

c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

X		
---	--	--

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)

X		
---	--	--

b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
---	--	--

Dissertations/Project reports

a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

a. Were you able to attend the meeting? (**only one**)

X		
---	--	--

b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

X		
---	--	--

c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?

X		
---	--	--

d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

X		
---	--	--

e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

		X
--	--	---

Any other comments?
Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

I can confirm that both programmes satisfy all the criteria for accreditation by the Chartered Institute of Building.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at
Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	YES
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers

(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

BSV11106 Law and Administration
BSV11107 Analysis of Property Investment Market Data
BSV11108 Property Investment Analysis
BSV11109 Property Asset Management
BSV11110 Property Development
BSV11111 Building Economics
BSV11120 Dissertation

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

MSc Property Management and Investment

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	YES	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	YES	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	YES	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	YES	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

I am satisfied that there was parity between modules. There were a number of units with relatively high failure rates examined at the Board and there appeared to be valid reasons supporting the level of performance. Unit Leaders appeared to be alert to the issues raised by this. This was not a particular issue with regard to PMI students.

I am of the opinion that the standards are comparable to similar courses at other UK institutions. It is pleasing to see a number of distinctions being awarded.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

I am satisfied that there is an appropriate level of academic challenge being set in each unit.

There are some relevant and practical coursework assignments being set and these are providing adequate opportunity to distinguish the differential levels of performance achieved by individual students.

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

With a small number of students enrolled it is difficult to generalise about the overall level of student performance as the discerning characteristics are aligned with the performance of individual students. That said there appears to be an acceptable level of performance with most students completing the course, some after resit opportunities.

The Course Leader is alert to the different learning requirements of full-time versus part-time distance learning students and it is recommended that there is continuing monitoring of this with regard to the equality of outcome for each type of student.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

Having reviewed module handbooks and other documentation and talked with staff I am satisfied that the teaching and learning methods used are appropriate to the needs of the students and that there is good alignment with assessment tasks.

Some practitioners contribute to the course and are able to use recent case studies. It is recommended that guest lecturers continue to be used to good effect.

I was not able to meet any students so did not have exposure to their perspective of the quality and relevance of the teaching and learning environment.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

I have sampled work across all of the units including the dissertation (all reviewed). Once again I am satisfied that there is a fair and appropriate workload of assessment.

There is a good variety of assessment type and appropriate grading of student performance.

There is evidence of good feedback on most coursework scripts. There appears to be two different feedback sheets in operation and I would recommend that standardisation would be helpful to students and also support greater consistency across modules.

I found evidence of good mentoring of a (new?) external marker to ensure comparability of grades.

I am satisfied that sample marking is taking place but it may be worth considering making the documentation of this more explicit.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

Module reports provide some insightful analysis.

There is a very committed Course Leader and teaching team.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

Continue to have regard to the learning experience of distance learning students. Maintaining the quality of such material is time consuming and requires review of electronic platform opportunities. The quality of this provision can only be maintained if adequate resources are directed to it.

Consider adopting a standardisation coursework feedback sheet.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

YES		
YES		
YES		
YES		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

YES		
YES		
YES		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

YES		
YES		
YES		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

YES		
-----	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

YES		
		NA
YES		
YES		

e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

YES		
-----	--	--

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

This concludes my term as External Examiner.

I believe the course to be in good heart with a committed, professional and well organised Course Leader. The teaching team is effective and dedicated to providing students with an excellent learning experience.

The low level of recruitment over recent years has been disappointing but indicative of the industry wide recession. It is now very pleasing to see a pick-up in recruitment following the recovery across the industry and profession and hopefully this will gather pace.

The acid test for a course of this nature is how employable the students are and using this measure the course is a great success.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	x
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers

(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

BSV11114 Sustainable Building Design
 BSV11116 Analysis and Timber Design
 BSV11117 Timber Materials Applications
 BSV11118 Timber Form and Construction
 BSV11119 Analysis of Timber Design 2
 BSV11120 Dissertation

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

MSc Timber Engineering

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	x	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	x	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	x	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	x	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The standards of the work in the modules and the effort required is comparable with courses I am involved with at my own institution and in other that I have examined. I have examined a similar Master's, not in the topic of timber engineering, but similarly directed to a 'specialist' technical area of the construction industry. I feel there are many comparable issues in the depth of engineering analysis and the practical application is quite similar.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Over the 4 years I have examined the programme I do feel that the academic standard is at an appropriate level for the a Master's and has been rather consistent during this period

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

The student performance is generally good. It is quite evident when looking at the performance of individual students across modules that good students seem to perform well generally and less able students tend to show similar profiles across modules. This year in BSV 11119 analysis of timber there was an interesting spread of marks in the four papers submitted. Three were between 47-51 and the fourth 87, I think that this is in the nature of paper itself, although I don't recall the trend being so apparent in other years. The code based design is very much procedurally based and assessment is predicated on how effectively the students follow the procedures. It may be worth reviewing this to see if this could be assessed in a different manner.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

The methods are generally appropriate the pedagogic aims of the programme. As mentioned in previous reports the balance between technical content and practical applications is worth developing. The incorporation of the design study in BSV1119 is good but I would encourage colleagues to consider how elements such as construction detail in Timber form and construction and Sustainable Building Design may relate to the project. It may be that there are practical reasons relating to the modules being available that make linking difficult but students may benefit from a broader holistic project.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

The assessment is fair, the comments in section 4 are not about the assessment itself but rather the structure of that part of the module. I think that the standard of the dissertations is generally good and I have felt that the marks could often be a little higher. I think that the feedback form, divided into 8 headings perhaps suppresses the marks and constrains the nature of the feedback. It would be worth considering an alternative process that allowed for a more discursive feedback.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

The degree is generally well managed. I did not get the opportunity to discuss the programme with students this year. I think that there is a good balance of different elements within the programme.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

My main recommendations are ones I have suggested previously. Given the industry focus of the course and perhaps reflecting my own background in design based programmes. I would like to see greater attention to the application of the course materials in project based studies. Timber is often used in quite particular projects and creative design applications are often necessary, therefore I would suggest that the project component of BSV11119 be developed further, perhaps giving greater weight to the project than the exam.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

X		
X		
X		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

X		
X		
X		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?

X		
X		

- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

x		
x		
x		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

This is my last report as external examiner. I have enjoyed the period as examiner and I have learned more about timber engineering. The course has been developed to meet a particular industry need. Most schools of engineering do not include structural engineering with timber and tend to focus on steel and concrete. Timber is becoming more and more important in architecture and construction partly for its inherent qualities and partly driven by the need to use more renewable materials. This course therefore meets an important need. Given my knowledge of engineering programmes I do feel that the course builds effectively on the underpinning content one would expect from a generic engineering programme, in terms of the particular complexities of timber as a structural material and its application in sustainable architecture and construction. Edinburgh Napier has a well deserved reputation in timber engineering research and this is clearly evident in the quality of the dissertations.

My main suggestion is to continue to develop ways to further integrate the various modules together towards more open-ended design applications. I think that students would benefit considerably from this.

I would like to thank both the academic staff and administrative staff for their support and input and wish them well in the on-going development of the programme



Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

All External Examiners are requested to fill in a report upon completion of their duties associated with **first diet assessments** each session. Please note that all sections of the report must be completed for payment to be authorised.

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Review Committee will also receive a summary report of general themes from the reports submitted in each academic year.

You are reminded that you must not name individual students or staff members in your report, and you should be aware that an anonymised version of this report will be published on the University's Academic Quality website.

The deadlines for submission of reports for session 2013/14 are

- 07 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 27 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

If you have any questions or problems completing this form please contact externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk

Duties

Is this report for:	mark as appropriate
Programmes and Modules	✓
Modules only	

Please insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers

(This information was sent to you on your appointment, if you require this information to be re-sent, please request this at externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk):

CTR11112 Public Transport
 CTR11105 Transport Policy
 CTR11115 Traffic Engineering and Control
 CTR11103 Traffic Management
 CTR11116 Transport Economics and Appraisal
 CTR11120 Development Planning and Transport Assessment
 CTR11106 Transport Research methods
 CTR11121 Issues in Freight Transport
 CTR11117 Dissertation
 CTR11104 Transport and Traffic Models

Please insert the programme title(s) to which this report refers (if appropriate):

MSc/PgDip/PgCert Transport Planning and Engineering

Section B:

In accordance with Edinburgh Napier University regulations A9.4a-d, please confirm the following:

	Yes	No
<p>Academic Issues Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level?</p>	✓	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	✓	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	✓	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	✓	

Section C:

1) Comparability

Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.

The standard of student work is comparable both between modules and between these Programmes and similar Programmes in other Institutions (e.g. those within the UK's Universities Transport Partnership).

2) Commentary on Academic issues

Is the academic standard of each module or programme of study being considered set and maintained at the appropriate level, meeting the threshold academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

Yes, I am satisfied that the Academic Standard across all modules is being maintained at the appropriate level

3) Student Performance

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content

The range of student performance and outcomes is what would be typically expected from a cohort of students within differing backgrounds and abilities. As with other postgraduate Programmes of this type, the International students are often more challenged by the qualitative written work, but can excel at the quantitative elements. This balances out overall.

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes

There is a good range of Learning and Teaching methods used within the modules (lectures, seminars, design classes, etc) and some students study by Distance Learning. One area for potential enhancement is to introduce more outside visits (to transport infrastructure & operations sites, etc), perhaps even extending into a study tour.

5) Assessment

Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes

Assessment is fair and thorough (anonymous double/treble marking is standard) and feedback is generally good.

6) Good practice

Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight

- Having a clear Programme identity with expertise and consistency in Academic leadership, lecturing contributions and Administrative support.
- The Programme management team are extremely approachable and helpful.
- Sending Examination and coursework questions/solutions to me electronically (to quicken the process) and in an encrypted form (to ensure confidentiality).

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

1. For the University to consider holding Module Boards and Programme Boards at the same time, with the External Examiner(s) in attendance. Provision of an overall spreadsheet, showing all students and all module marks is recommended.
2. For External Examiners to meet a random sample of, say, 25% of students to get their views on all aspects of the programme.
3. To introduce more external study visits to transport-related sites, including consideration of a study tour.
4. To replace the grading system for assessment with a simpler numerical mark (%).
5. To have prescribed submission deadlines for Distance Learning students.
6. To develop guidelines for the expected length of Dissertations (eg range of word count) to encourage precise writing.
7. To ensure that the Academic team has sufficient time and resources to update teaching material as required.

Section D:

This checklist is included to take into account the recommendation from the review of external examining arrangements in universities in the UK undertaken by Guild HE and Universities UK. We welcome any comments you have about this section.

Yes	No	NA
-----	----	----

Programme and Module materials: have you received or been given access to:

- a. Programme Handbook(s)
- b. Academic Regulations
- c. Module Descriptors
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

✓		
✓		
✓		
✓		

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)
- b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

✓		
✓		
✓		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- a. Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts and coursework marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

✓		
✓		
✓		

Dissertations/Project reports

- a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

✓		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?

✓		
---	--	--

- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
- e. Were issues raised in previous report(s) addressed to your satisfaction?

		✓
✓		
✓		
✓		

Any other comments?

Please use this space to address any other comments you wish to make, including but not limited to

- a) any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body
- b) an overview of your term of office (when concluded).

To thank the Programme Academic and Administrative team for their help over the past year.

Thank you for completing this report and for undertaking External Examiner duties at Edinburgh Napier University.

Please email the completed report to externalexaminers@napier.ac.uk