

School of Life Sport and Social Sciences

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	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):

Module Duties

Perspectives on Integrated Healthcare
 Complementary Healthcare Honours Project
 Promoting Mental Health – Complementary, Alternative and Conventional Approaches
 Ethnomedicine
 Clinical Practice 4
 Herbal Medicine Honours Project
 Clinical Medicine and Diagnosis 6
 Materia Medica and Herbal Practice 6

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

Programme Duties

BSc(Hons) Herbal Medicine F/T
 BSc(Hons) Herbal Medicine P/T
 BA (Hons) Complementary Healthcare (Reflexology) F/T
 BA (Hons) Complementary Healthcare (Reflexology) P/T
 BA (Hons) Complementary Healthcare (Aromatherapy) F/T
 BA (Hons) Complementary Healthcare (Aromatherapy) P/T

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	

Section C:

- **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 programme includes relevant issues on professional practice including a module on ethics, accountability and risk assessment. Also a module is included on work based practice and working in a multidisciplinary setting. The key issues of approaches to health and social care are fully addressed.

The comparability of standards between modules demonstrated consistency and the academic standard very high, comparable, in my experience, with other higher education institutions running CAM therapy courses.

- **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 a high academic standards, and where applicable, the [subject benchmark statements](#) and [SCQF level](#) descriptors

The academic standard for all modules demonstrated a high level of meeting appropriate academic benchmarks and SCQF levels.

- **Student Performance**

Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect

to module and/or programme content

Regarding the over-all programme content, student performance strengths were reflected in the range of learning skills developed and demonstrated including academic learning and performance, also clinical experience and associated reflective practice, encompassing ethical issues and accountability and perspectives in healthcare, including integrated health issues.

- **Learning and Teaching**

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

Ethics and accountability are demonstrated, for example, demonstrated in modules CPT10102 & CPT11100 when dealing with mental health. The key issues of approaches to health and social care appear to be fully addressed.

A sufficient level of information is given regarding assessment guidelines: any queries have been addressed and fully justified.

Evidence of thorough and often excellent detailed feedback is given to all students from the range of scripts provided.

Correct marking and evidence of double marking is provided: queries on double marking procedures have been explained to a satisfactory level.

- **Assessment**

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

Academic assessment throughout the modules demonstrated clarity of structure and sound, fair assessment guidelines were provided, with clear explanatory guidelines to the student and provided excellent student access to information resources and tutor support.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good practice
Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight
In my opinion, the programme was innovative by encompassing a range of CAM therapies and introducing students to a wide range of different healthcare approaches and working in a multidisciplinary setting, providing a foundation for further academic study, research, and development of professional healthcare practice.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations
Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.
N/A as the course is closing

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:			
• Programme Handbook(s)	Yes		
• Academic Regulations	Yes		

• Module Descriptors	Yes		
• Assessment briefs/marketing criteria	Yes		
Draft Examination Papers			
• Did you receive all the draft papers (answer 'NA' if you did not because it was at your request)			N/A
• Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?			N/A
• Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			N/A
Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts			
• Did you receive as a minimum a square root sample of completed scripts or coursework? (as specified in regulation A9.4)	Yes		
• Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?	Yes		
• 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			
• Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?	Yes		
Board of Examiners meeting			
• Were you able to attend the meeting?		No	
• If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?	Yes, had opportunity to meet with programme leader and module leader to discuss issues from meeting and received feedback from board		

	meeting		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction? 	Yes (as above)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners? 	Yes		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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

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

My experience of my term in office was that I found the staff extremely helpful and accommodating to recommendations, or queries raised.

The programme fulfilled relevant professional requirements and provided a sound basis for academic learning combined with practical experience. It is extremely unfortunate that the course has had to close.

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	<input type="checkbox"/>
Modules only	<input type="checkbox"/>

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):

All Sociology modules in BA (Hons) Psychology & Sociology (all routes) and BA (Hons) Social Sciences

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>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

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.

Expectations of performance and academic rigour are comparable with those to be found in other higher education 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. Clearly articulated standards of performance and academic practice are set in each module. These are appropriate for the level of study

3) Student Performance

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

As with other years, I have seen some examples of work of excellent standard. The students performed in line with expectations. On the whole this seemed a good cohort of students.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

Reorganisation of RSS as preparation and training for the dissertation is welcome.

5) Assessment

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

I applaud the changes of coursework in EPS and RSS.

In EPS, the collaboration with Design students was really innovative and it was heartening to see what the fruits of these collaborations were. They yielded really striking posters with very punchy messages. Very innovative. I noted that the marks allocated were high but they reflected the quality of the work produced. The ones which attracted the highest marks (80%) were, rightly, rewarded for critical content.

In RSS, the decision to assess the ethical consent process is a very good one and on the whole the work received appropriate marks and comments. The lack of methods references in the second piece of coursework should be addressed.

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.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		

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?

<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		

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

<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		

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

--	--	--

Dissertations/Project reports

a. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

<input type="checkbox"/>		
--------------------------	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

a. Were you able to attend the meeting?

<input type="checkbox"/>		
--------------------------	--	--

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

<input type="checkbox"/>		
--------------------------	--	--

c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?

<input type="checkbox"/>		
--------------------------	--	--

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

<input type="checkbox"/>		
--------------------------	--	--

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

	<input type="checkbox"/>	
--	--------------------------	--

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 late delivery of material continues to be a problem and I am aware that this is a structural issue, rather than a Programme issue. It's a problem externals appear to share in quite a few universities. It arises in part from the compression of the academic calendar and more generally processes of decision-making which do not take into account the lived experience of academics and administrators on the ground.

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):

PSY09100: Researching Psychology
 PSY09103: Individual Differences 2
 PSY09113: Forensic Psychology 1
 PSYP09114: Brain and Cognition

PSY10100: Honours Project
 PSY10102: Educational Psychology
 PSY10112: Forensic Psychology

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

BA (Hons) Psychology

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 performances across the modules were of a comparable standard to those I have experience of at other Higher Education Institutions.</p> <p>There was a good level of consistency in marking between the modules. Assessments used enabled appropriate differentiation between the performance of students at the higher and lower ends of the range.</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>Yes. There is a solid academic knowledge base covered in the modules and the material I examined was appropriate to the demands of L9 and L10 standards in the subject domain. A number of the modules embed the development of important professional skills within them by encouraging students to critically examine important issues from a scientific evidence base and to consider the development of their own critical writing and analyses skills.</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>Students undertaking the modules had a varied range of performance which indicated that the programme differentiates between the stronger and weaker performers.</p> <p>The students who demonstrated higher levels of performance did so through excellent writing skills coupled with very strong critical analyses of the extensive evidence bases they reviewed. The less able students demonstrated less developed writing and critical analyses skills, often underpinned with little evidence or wider reading to back up the points they presented.</p> <p>The Honours Projects reviewed demonstrated a variety of research approaches being used (quantitative and qualitative) and an interesting range of topics being researched. It indicated that students work demonstrates key subject benchmark skills in research and showed how the programme supports students in this important area.</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>

The programme and modules make use of a range of learning and teaching approaches and this is to be commended.

The modules have clear learning outcomes and the teaching and learning strategies support these outcomes.

The students show good engagement with the different approaches used. It was observed how these helped the students to learn subject specific knowledge, as well as develop important skills of relevance to their future employability and development. Teaching and learning strategies make use of reflective writing and review to enable students to develop self-analyses skills to enhance their academic and personal development.

5) Assessment

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

The modules that I have reviewed demonstrated a range of assessment strategies being used to assess knowledge and to develop important skills. The assessments given were appropriate to the L9 and L10 levels of learning. They presented interesting topics that ensured students had to use, and consider, the implications of the facts and knowledge being learned, in order to answer the assessments given.

There was clear evidence of blind marking being used and this was to be commended. The moderation process was also in evidence with first, second and in some cases third and fourth levels of moderations taking place, to ensure fairness in marking across a module.

The level of feedback given was commendable. There appears to be a clear focus on helping students to understand their areas of strength and the areas where they could improve their work to enhance future learning.

The use of marking sheets and the provision of guidance notes was seen to be useful in making the assessment process more transparent.

Some variability in the amount of assessments required was noted and it is encouraging to note that they are reviewing the issue prior to the next delivery of the module.

6) Good practice

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

The range of teaching and learning strategies used to engage the students.

The level of support given to students.

The moderation of marks is to be commended.

The range of assessment tasks provided gives students different ways to develop important skills and demonstrate their learning.

The provision of marking criteria and guidance documentation.

The feedback provided was constructive and helpful for future learning.

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

Y		
Y		
Y* (most provided)		
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?

Y		
		NA
Y		
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).

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):

Practical Coaching

Research Projects

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 can only comment about the two modules that I've seen, as I'm not the main external examiner for this programme.

The standards of student work were fairly similar in the two modules, although the dissertations were (unspringing) better on the whole. The standard of work was fairly similar to the standard of work of students from other new universities.

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 happy with the current standards in terms of student learning, thoroughness of assessment, and the development of appropriate skills and reflective competencies.

3) Student Performance

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

Student performance for the practical coaching module lacked critical insight, with a few exceptions. The standards of the dissertations were somewhat better, but there were several issues in terms of quantitative skills and the ability to appropriately report the results of statistical analyses. There were also examples of original thought, good personal insight and

ability to link theory with practice.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

I am happy with the learning and teaching methods employed for the two modules. I am not sure how effective they are; it would have been good to have access to the student evaluation forms.

5) Assessment

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

The marking criteria were clear and in some cases very detailed. For the Practical Coaching module it was not always clear how the general comments on the cover page corresponded to specific pages or paragraphs in the student work. I suggested the development of a matrix scheme to facilitate such cross-reference. For the final year projects I would have liked to see the overall mark of each assessor alongside the agreed mark.

6) Good practice

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

The moderation is detailed and transparent.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

1. The marking procedure for the dissertations should be clearer. I suggest that the marking form lists the mark of each assessor.
2. The project proposals should be made available alongside the research projects so that the learning progress of each student can be assessed.
3. A matrix marking scheme could be developed for the Practical Coaching module.
4. I suggest that the School moves to electronic marking. This will facilitate the development of matrix marking schemes and the provision of more legible and faster feedback to the students.

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?

	X; I attended the module board only, not the programme board	
--	--	--

- 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).

--



There is clear evidence of hard work by the staff delivering the two modules in providing diverse teaching and assessment methods, and constructive feedback. Staff teaching on these modules should be congratulated

This is my last year as an external examiner. Overall, I am happy with what I have seen and discussed. The staff have taken on board my previous comments about moderation. Because I was not the main external examiner, I do not feel that I can make any generic recommendations besides the modules I was asked to comment upon. However, as I mentioned in my report last year, there is a need for greater clerical support in ensuring that the external examiners are provided with all required information prior to the module board meeting (some of this information was missing again this year, in particular student profiles of marks). Also, more contact with the external examiners prior to the meeting would be welcome. I had to email various academic staff to provide me with information about my visit that should have been given to me by the administrative staff at the School.

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)

Title : Professor

Email address: jim.mckechnie@uws.ac.uk

Surname: McKechnie

Date report completed : 16th June 2014

First name : Jim

Institution : University of the West of Scotland

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):

<i>ModuleCode</i>	<i>Module Title</i>
PSY09104	Counselling Psychology
PSY09106	Social Psychology 2
PSY10104	Critical Psychology
PSY10105	Psychology of Lifespan Development
PSY09110	Applied Psychology for Health and Wellbeing
PSY09105	Health Psychology
PSY09113	Forensic Psychology
PSY10107	Abnormal Psychology
SSC10106	Honours Project

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

<i>Programme Code</i>	<i>Programme Title</i>
	BA (Hons) Psychology with Sociology
	BA (Hons) Psychology
	BSc (Hons) Psychology

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 results on individual modules were comparable to similar modules at other institutions that I have experience off.
Student performances on the modules at each level were comparable. The assessments were effective at discriminating between the stronger and weaker students. Across all of the modules there was coherence in the standards of marking and a good level of agreement between first and second markers.
The more able students performed well across a range of modules.

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

As in previous years the material that I reviewed was appropriate for L9 and L10 assessment. There is a clear distinction between the demands of 3rd and 4th year modules. It is noticeable that a number of modules encourage and reward the development of critical thinking. The subject benchmarks clearly inform the assessment strategy and some modules develop key skills that are embedded within the subject benchmark statements e.g. qualitative data analysis.

3) Student Performance

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

Student performance this year was strong with a number of 1st class degrees being awarded and a good profile of 2.i degrees. The strongest students demonstrated that they had a strong knowledge base and adopted an evidence based approach when addressing the assessment questions. The weaker students were less able to reflect on the material that they were discussing and lacked the more able students capacity to demonstrate critical thinking.

As in previous years the final year project work that I reviewed demonstrated that the majority of students had a good understanding of the research process. The range of topics and methodologies covered in this work indicates that the students are being provided with good academic support from the teaching team.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

It is evident from the module material that staff put considerable effort into the design of their assessments and module structure. This reflects a good understanding of teaching and learning strategies. Student performance indicates that the quality of teaching is high with a clear emphasis on developing a range of key skills as well as knowledge.

The range of assessments is impressive with some excellent ideas such as the coursework that requires students to write a journal editorial on a specific topic. In some cases the novel forms of assessments are linked to electives and it's not clear to what extent the team have looked at the assessment profile that students are exposed to on the core modules. I'm sure the team have considered this and have an overall plan and it would be interesting to see this.

5) Assessment

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

Across the modules that I reviewed a range of assessments were used that were clearly linked to specific skill development. The sample of assessment provided for review demonstrated that staff provide feedback on all coursework. There is some variation in the form this takes (e.g. pro forma, narratives). I also wondered if staff have considered the use of Turnitin for feedback.

I should emphasise that there is some excellent feedback practice on some modules and these could be used as examples of 'good practice' that all modules should adopt. I'd also suggest that some consideration could be given to having a 'standard' pro forma for essay and reports along with some guidance on minimal standards of feedback. The latter would address the odd case where feedback was not as clear or detailed.

In previous reports I have raised the issue of the transparency of the assessment grading and marking procedures. This specifically relates to modules where presentations are used as part of the assessment. I am pleased to see that steps have been taken to develop assessment strategies and marking guidelines to address this. I would suggest that the team continue to consider the option of recording presentations. This has the advantage of ensuring that presentations are open to external review and that you are guarded against appeals on this type of assessment they should all be recorded. It also offers the opportunity to use the recordings as part of students PDP.

6) Good practice

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

The range of assessments used
The innovative nature of some assessments
The high quality of student support material on some modules
The quality of feedback provided on some modules

I would also commend the group on the running of the exam Boards. The final degree awarding Board was rigorous and it was clear that staff gave due consideration to all students.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

1. As in previous years there is some variability in the range of materials provided in the external examiners pack. I would suggest that some standardisation of the information provided is necessary. This should include a copy of module spreadsheet with means, SDs etc provided, along with copies of the module handbook, assessments, sample scripts and the module review document.
2. There are some excellent examples of high quality feedback being provided to students; however, there are also some examples of limited feedback. In addition there are variations in the form of the feedback being provided e.g. some modules use standard pro forma others do not. I would suggest that you look at the examples of good practice and use these across all modules.
3. In previous years the evidence of robust second marking procedures has been provided. This year the procedure for second marking was not always so clear. I believe that your previous practices were a real strength and would be concerned if the University's marking timescales are having a negative effect on this. I would also suggest that where there are disagreements in marking an explanation is provided for the final agreement.
4. As in all of my previous reports I have raised the issue of the marking scale used. I continue to have difficulty identifying 1% differences across essays on the same topic. If the group is unable to change to a category type system (e.g. 60, 63, 65, 68, 70). I'd suggest that there needs to be some development of the criteria for marking within bands. This may also help to address the treatment of poor exam answers. I noted that there was some variation across modules in the treatment of answers that were "not addressing the question" or "not relevant to the question"
5. The external's role in reviewing assessment appears to be limited to reviewing exam papers. In other institutions it is common to have external input on all assessments. I hesitate to generate additional work for externals but I believe that having externals comment on draft exams but not on other assessments is inconsistent.

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(*some were provided)	
	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 (*a small number were not)		

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?
- 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		
	In some cases	

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).

N/A

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Modules only	<input type="checkbox"/>

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):





HSS 10106, HSS09103 HSS 09106

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

BA (hons) Youth Work part time

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 modules I examined were of a comparable standard with the work of students in similar institutions. I also felt that work was comparable between the various modules I examined.

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 module outlines make clear reference to relevant benchmarks and these are addressed in the module content. It would be useful to make more explicit reference to these benchmarks by ensuring that marking of work is clearly linked to comments about the extent to which students have met the learning outcomes.

3) Student Performance

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

The stronger students have clearly engaged with theory and are beginning to relate this to practice. The weaker students do not seem to have engaged with theory and their discussion of practice tends to remain at a descriptive level,

4) Learning and Teaching

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

This is a work based learning programme with students spending most of their time in practice. The course team makes effective use of moodle to engage the students and I saw some good examples of students discussions in the work examined. However it was apparent that not all students were engaging fully in the academic support available and this is apparent in a lack of ability to relate theory to practice. I understand that this could be linked to lack of attendance at taught elements of the programme. I would encourage the course team and the university to explore mechanisms to address non- attendance as this is a requirement of the professional endorsement.

5) Assessment

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

The feedback on assignments is good especially in relation to grammar and referencing styles. I would like to see more feedback in relation to the learning outcomes so that students are clear about the extent to which they have addressed them and about areas for improvement.

6) Good practice

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

I was impressed with the use of the virtual learning environment

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

- **Ensure that comments on assignments make reference to learning outcomes**
- **Explore mechanisms to improve attendance at taught sessions.**





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:

- Programme Handbook(s)
- Academic Regulations
- Module Descriptors
- Assessment briefs/marketing criteria


Draft Examination Papers

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

NA		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

- 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).

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	yes

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):

HSS09102 Working and Learning in Youth Work 2
HSS07108 youth work theory and Practice

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>	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 work was comparable across all modules

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

There was a wide range of performance, but in general students had a good grasp of the key points

4) Learning and Teaching

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on

the modules and/or programmes

From the portfolios, the teaching appears to be 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

No issues

6) Good practice

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

n/a

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

More guidance to students on making portfolios easily readable and markable

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).

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):

79403BH BSc (Honours) Biological Sciences

M1C09100	Medical Microbiology
M1C09101	Scientific Communication – Dissertation and Statistics
M1C09102	Environmental Microbiology
M1C09103	Food Microbiology and Biotechnology
M1C10100	Medical Biotechnology
M1C10102	Biotechnology – Industry and Environment
M1C10105	Applications of Molecular Biology
ENV10100	Honours Project

79401BD BSc Biological Sciences (Hong Kong)

BMS09601	Introductory and Applied Molecular Genetics (Hong Kong)
BMS09603	Applied Immunology (Hong Kong)
M1C09602	Medical Microbiology (Hong Kong)
M1C09604	Food Microbiology and Biotechnology (Hong Kong)
M1C09605	Research Skills (Hong Kong)
M1C09606	Dissertation (Hong Kong)
M1C09607	Scientific Communication - Dissertation and Statistics (Hong Kong)
M1C09608	Microbiology Testing (Hong Kong)
BMS10600	Mechanistic Toxicology (Hong Kong)
M1C10600	Applications of Molecular Biology (Hong Kong)
M1C10601	Biotechnology - Industry and Environment (Hong Kong)
M1C10602	Research/Work-Related Project (Hong Kong)

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

79401BD BSc Biological Sciences (Hong Kong)

79403BH BSc (Honours) Biological Sciences

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 student work and the broad range of marks attained in modules reviewed are comparable to other higher educational 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

All modules were of an appropriate standard in terms of content, assessment and academic standards. They were well aligned with the subject benchmark statements and for both the UG modules and the Hong Kong modules conformed to the SCQF level descriptors.

3) Student Performance

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

Undergraduate Programme

Student performance varied considerably between modules, a reflection of student engagement and effort within the modules. This appears to be a problem within the current Level 3 cohort with generally lower mean marks and fewer “exceptional” answers than have been seen within previous cohorts. There are also more borderline marks than previously seen. At Level 4 there were some exceptional marks showing application of knowledge, independent research, critical analyses and excellent theoretical knowledge. The ability of the students to link, apply and analyse knowledge in relation to current research and usage is very positive and desirable by employers.

All students are taught in a very supportive system, however few take advantage of the full range of support and directed help that is on offer. Some students also loose marks by not following the instructions/information that are clearly cited in the assessment briefs.

Hong Kong Programme

It is heartening to see a significant improvement in the module performance this year and whilst there are few exceptional performances, the range of marks has seen a positive shift

upwards. The strategic support mechanisms that have been put in place have had a positive impact.

Some students are still struggling with language and fail to appreciate the depth and volume of knowledge required to attain a good mark.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

The diverse range of Learning and Teaching methods employed on both the UG and Hong Kong modules are appropriate. They allow students to engage in the learning process in a variety of ways and help to enhance the transferable and employability skills of the students. The strong link between theoretical and application of information is to be commended as it prepares students for employment.

Student engagement in directed learning material and the VLE varies considerably and appears to be very targeted.

Changes to the delivery of some module materials in Hong Kong (vidcasts, directed learning and support sessions) appears to have had a very positive impact on the cohort by focusing their learning.

5) Assessment

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

Module assessments were rigorous but fair and students were given excellent briefs and guidance. They were set at an appropriate level that challenged the best students and gave them opportunity to show extended knowledge and advanced thinking, whilst allowing all students to demonstrate core knowledge. Module assessments were varied and therefore students were not solely depending on one "type" of assessment, again allowing the students to show a range of skills and levels.

In coursework assignments many students are still losing marks for failing to follow the basic brief/assessment instructions (format, referencing, length, etc).

6) Good practice

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

The introduction of strategically targeted support for Hong Kong modules has had a very positive impact on the module marks. This approach could be extended to all the Hong Kong modules and the UG modules at Napier.

The use of vidcasts, directed learning and then support tutorials is an ideal model for developing independent learning and the skills expected at these levels. Again it would be

ideal if this approach could be extended to other modules both in Hong Kong and in the UG Napier modules.

The strong link between core knowledge and application in modules is to be commended. It definitely prepares the student for work in the real world.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

Continue to develop and offer the Confident Futures sessions as a way of enhancing the skills and development of the students. However the success of these sessions is reliant on the engagement of the students.

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)	X		
b. Academic Regulations	X		
c. Module Descriptors	X		
d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria	X		

Draft Examination Papers

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

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?

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?
- 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 BSc Programme	X (Hong Kong Programme)	
X (Hong Kong Programme)		
X BSc Programme		
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).

It has been a very positive experience to have worked with such a committed group of staff and to have seen the positive impact that this had on the student experience during my tenure. The modules have developed and certainly meet the need of the future Bioscience graduate



employment market in terms of core Bioscience knowledge and skills, but also in terms of the transferable and life skills.

I hope the programmes continue to thrive and wish the teams every 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

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):

Intermediate Biomechanics SES09109

Sports Injury Rehabilitation SES09100

Analysis of Sports Performance SES10106

Scientific Analysis of Human Movement SES10108

Scientific Research Project SES10113

Performance and Practice in Sport and Exercise Science SES09107

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

BSc (Hons) Sport and Exercise Science

BSc (Hons) Sport and Exercise Science (Coaching)

BSc (Hons) Sport and Exercise Science (Injury)

BSc (Hons) Sport and Exercise Science (Exercise Physiology)

BSc (Hons) Sport and Exercise Science (Sport Psychology)

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.

Student work was generally comparable with previous years and with other academic institutions. Once again, two modules (Intermediate Biomechanics SES09109 and Sports Injury Rehabilitation SES09100) showed lower attainment than others.

As the latter is a Year 3 module, this could possibly lower final classifications, although students are permitted to drop some low marks in Year 3. The work for this module was marked very thoroughly, but I wondered if too much emphasis was being placed on spelling and grammar (as only 10% of marks were awarded for this aspect), although I appreciate it is difficult to communicate ideas if grammar is not correct. There was only one 1st class overall (out of 76 students) in this module (with mean mark 49.2%) suggesting poor student performance across the board. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend the board due to family bereavement, but would be interested to discuss the continued low marks with module tutors

In Intermediate Biomechanics, the mean mark dropped slightly. I was in contact with the module organizer by e-mail and she stated that student attendance was poor for this module, although those students who attended rated the module favourably in the evaluations.

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 set are appropriate and tally well with benchmark and SCQF descriptors.

3) Student Performance

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

The final year projects I saw showed a wide range of student performance. Those students in the first class group showed excellent work, which would receive similar grades at other

universities. Weaker students showed lack of organization, weak critical skills and poor data analysis, warranting the poor grades and negative comments.

Last year, I commented upon the fact that higher grades were received in the proposal than in the final report, and this was also a feature of this year's cohort (even with allowance for non-completion of 6 projects). My calculations suggest that nearly 75% of the cohort attained higher marks in the proposal than the final report. This suggests that students generate good ideas and research questions but do not carry them out well, or that the marking is harder on the final report than the proposal. I would recommend that the Programme Director and the module organizer discuss this with the team, as the quality of the final projects is an important marker of student independent work.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

Students are exposed to high quality lectures and laboratory sessions. There is good evidence that they learn how to use appropriate techniques for collecting and analysing scientific data, and produce some excellent pieces of work. I was not able to meet students, (due to my inability to attend the boards mentioned above) so I do not know if laboratory access was such an issue as last year (raised in my last report as a recommendation). The use of Moodle is very good, but looks slightly 'plain' for some modules – I would encourage a 'corporate' attractive profile (maybe for the whole programme) where possible.

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 were generally well-constructed and rigorous. There was clear evidence of moderation by staff on assessed work, and double marking for the project was thorough and effective.

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.

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).

Although I have answered NO for some of the above, this is only for some modules. However, I did receive information rather late in some cases. The change in Programme Director combined with the departure of the administrator probably affected the communication process, as well as my rather sudden personal reasons (and thus late notice) for not being able to attend the boards as expected.

I would therefore request that information such as draft examinations and assessment selections for all modules are provided as fully and early as possible for next year. I hope that I will be able to attend either or both the January or the June Boards next year and also meet staff and students.

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):

Muscle Fatigue, Pain and Damage (SES10114)

Growth, Maturation and Exercise (SES09104/09904)

Intermediate Exercise Physiology (SES09102) Assessment Conditioning for Performance (SES09106)

Scientific Communication: Dissertation and Statistics (SES09111)

Performance and Practice in SES (SES09107)

Final year project

Please see module reviews attached with this report.

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:

<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 standard and quality of work taught in the BSc in Sports Science is both topical and comparable with other BSc taught courses nationally. The module guidelines provide clear evidence that the course is relevant to current on-going research into Sport and Exercise Science.</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>Based on the BSc course documentation and module guidelines, I am able to confirm that the level of module and delivery of module is appropriate for BSc level education.</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>Nothing specific to add here – please refer to supplementary report that deals specifically with each module that I was responsible for.</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 range of work presented and methods employed (face to face lectures, laboratory based practicals, tutorials, oral presentations), provided me with more than adequate evidence of student teaching and learning, with most assignments and projects achieving insights worthy of BSc level students.</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>Coursework marking was fair and equable with clear evidence of moderation by a second or third staff member</p>

<p>6) Good practice Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight</p>
<p>There are many areas of good practice worthy of mention, and these include (but not limited to – please also see supplementary report):</p> <p>The module packs provided by the module leaders are usually comprehensive and prepared to a high standard.</p> <p>The moderation of coursework marks, where many scripts are second or even third marked is commendable.</p> <p>The production of a module report (that includes extensive critical appraisal) is useful and one that is not often seen at other institutions.</p>
<p>7) Recommendations Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.</p>
<p>This was my fifth year as External Examiner to this University and programme, and my overall impression is that the course is well embedded and established within the University. It runs relatively smoothly as a result of excellent leadership. I would like to extend my sincere thanks to the entire course team for their hard work and professionalism over the course of the last academic year, and indeed throughout my tenure as external examiner.</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

X		
X		

c. Module Descriptors

X		
X		

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)

	X	

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)

X		
X		
X		

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?

X		
---	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

a. Were you able to attend the meeting?

X		
X		
X		
X		
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?

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 have nothing further to add to the above and what is included within my supplementary report.

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):

I am responsible for the following modules but not all of these were examined in this session. I have indicated in red those modules for which I viewed work.

ENV09105 Environmental Toxicology
 ENV09104 Marine Biology
 ENV09600 Environmental Toxicology (Hong Kong)
 ENV10105 Advances in Ecology
 ENV10104 Advances in Aquatic Science
 ENV10103 Environmental Management
 ENV10102 Advances in Animal Behaviour
 ENV10101 Fisheries Biology
 ENV09103 Population and Community Ecology
 ENV09102 Freshwater Biology
 ENV09100 Life of Mammals
 ENV09101 Applied Terrestrial Ecology
 ENV10106 Human and Ecosystem Health
 ENV10100 Scientific Research Project

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:

<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 standards of student work in modules that I viewed were indeed broadly comparable across modules and matched those which I am familiar with from my own institution and others where I have been external examiner. There was some variation in standards but this was well within the bounds of what I would accept as being typical. I would comment that the marking for exams is over a relatively narrow range: there is scope for both awarding very good marks to very good responses (of which I saw several) and also for awarding lower marks at the bottom end of the scale: i.e. students who have not performed sufficiently well to pass. If it's possible to award 90% (which it ought to be), it ought to be possible also to award 10%.</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 standard of modules was appropriate. I was able to view both student work in hard copy and, through Moodle, lecture and practical material. I am satisfied that for the modules I examined in detail standards are at a level appropriate to the level of the students and on a par with content which I am familiar with delivered across the sector. This was my first year as external at Edinburgh Napier and since my appointment has not required me to examine Level 10 modules, other than the project, I am unable to comment on level 10 or evidence of progression from Level 9 to 10 in what is required of students. The module content was all within areas covered by relevant benchmark statements. I expect to be able to offer a broader overview of coverage of benchmarks later in my term as examiner.</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 varied within the bounds of what would be expected. Module pass rates indicated that students were working at an appropriate level and that the teaching delivery on modules was acceptable. There were no obvious issues with underperformance at the module level. Some assignments had extremely good student performance: 09100 Life of Mammals museum assignment produced some very high marks, but these were associated with very good pieces of work, presumably indicating a high level of student engagement with the exercise. These high marks were somewhat moderated by a less good performance in the exam, which with three questions to be answered in 2 hours perhaps did not let the really good students distinguish themselves. There may be scope in this module to review</p>

the elements of the assessment in order to see student performance spread across a broader range in these assessments than was evident this year.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

For the modules I viewed there was a range of learning and teaching methods used. Most material, as far as I could see, is still delivered through formal lectures, and in viewing a range of lecture materials I felt that there may be scope for exploring some more innovative practices in delivery. Nevertheless the quality of several examination responses that I reviewed suggested that material delivered in lectures had been well retained and understood by students.

I am pleased to see a commitment to fieldwork in several modules. Field skills and experience are absolutely essential to progression from degree level to careers in research or practice in many of the programme areas of students taking these modules and the teaching team should be encouraged to maintain and expand opportunities for field teaching, particularly using the excellent regional field sites, in order to enhance the student experience and boost graduate prospects. I am aware that the teaching team are exploring the possibilities of professional accreditation of programmes. Several of the relevant accrediting bodies demand high volumes of field and practical work and the team (and faculty) should bear this in mind as programmes are developed.

I reviewed all the student projects and some were very good. I did wonder that, with these projects accounting for 60 credits, they are necessarily very substantial pieces of work and in order to be within the normal bounds of tariff/word count need to be quite long. This led (at least this year) in many cases to projects with very extensive literature reviews as their introductory sections. Several of these introductions were (necessarily) far broader than the project topic area. The result was somewhat unsatisfactory since the introductions tended to lack focus and did not lead well into the aims and objectives of the project. I think there is scope for diversifying the assessment in this module such that students are required to produce shorter, more focussed project reports and have marks awarded for additional assessment components which allow them to develop different research skills perhaps by producing scientific posters, popular science articles or by contributing to an intra-mural student conference.

5) Assessment

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

For modules I viewed the processes of assessment were fair: there was good evidence that students were well informed of the requirements of individual assessments and grading criteria and mark schemes were clear. I assume that these mark schemes are made available to students, though it was not always clear that this was the case.

I did find some of the mark schemes rather too rigid. While it is useful to define what students must do to achieve certain grades, pigeon-holing marks for certain sections of assignments can unduly restrict an assessor's ability to award a mark appropriate to a piece of work. The problem was evident in the final year projects where there were many disparities between marks awarded for different sections between first and second markers, though the overall marks were usually very close. This suggests that assessors may have apportioned marks to parts of the mark scheme with a final mark in mind. It would be more satisfactory to have a scheme which indicates the weighting of different

sections of a report but does not enforce this weighting and so allows assessors the flexibility to judge a piece of work holistically. The fact that for the projects, individual assessors frequently had similar opinions on the overall quality of individual projects despite disparity between marks awarded for individual sections is evidence that this approach may be appropriate and effective.

Overall there was good evidence of check marking in line with university procedures. There was a mixture of feedback practice. I saw some good evidence of electronic feedback and was able to discuss this briefly with some of the teaching team. This is an area of ongoing development in the sector and the teaching team are using a range of approaches to delivering feedback. There may be value in some additional training in this area as sector-wide practice and IT tools develop.

There was variable annotation of exam scripts. Some was excellent, clearly illustrating the justification for marks awarded, but in other cases there was not a great deal to go on. I am unsure as to whether a process exists for feedback to students on exams, but I would recommend that the teaching team consider introducing it if it does not exist, and doing some collective staff development on providing exam feedback/annotating scripts to ensure parity across all colleagues. Students tend to perform less well in exams than other forms of assessment and I think part of this is because of a lack of opportunity for reflection on their performance informed by feedback. As a side benefit, more detailed annotation would also help me in my role.

The examination papers I reviewed were interesting, relevant, at the right level and well compiled. However I did feel that in some (perhaps most) cases they asked too many things of the students. The variety of questions would, I think, be more appropriate for three hour rather than two hour papers. I am slightly concerned that in endeavouring to make papers challenging, very good students may be being disadvantaged because they have insufficient time to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding in full. Writing takes time, and if exams are to be tests of depth of understanding and not speed of writing then perhaps reducing the number of questions and expecting each to be answered in greater depth may help the best students excel.

6) Good practice

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

As I state above, the opportunities for fieldwork in several modules are to be commended. I was also pleased to see that several student projects took advantage of the regional environment and further afield for fieldwork and sample collection.

The teaching team should be commended for offering a very good range of research opportunities to their students across a diverse portfolio. It was apparent that in a large cohort certain members of staff had accommodated additional students but had clearly made an effort to ensure differentiation between projects in similar areas.

I was impressed with the level of quantitative skills displayed in student projects. Many students in the sector lack confidence in these skills and it was pleasing to see good basic skills on display as well as a variety of more advanced approaches to data analysis.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

I am very happy with the practices I have seen in reviewing student work and teaching materials, but the teaching team may wish to consider:

- Reviewing practice on examination marking and feedback
- Re-assessing the use of highly structured mark schemes, in particular for the final year projects.

- Reviewing the assessment profile for final year projects to include a greater variety of assessment and reduce the size of the final report.
- Reviewing the number of questions asked in examinations.

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:

- Programme Handbook(s)
- Academic Regulations
- Module Descriptors
- Assessment briefs/marketing criteria

X		
X		
X		
X		

Draft Examination Papers

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

X		
X		
X		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

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

X		
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?
- 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).

A comment on the check boxes in section D above:

I suppose these are useful for the quality office in being able to quickly vet whether an external views provision and practice as broadly adequate, particularly for the mechanics of the examining process, but the value in the process to the institution in my opinion is in the detail, which is obviously absent from such check-boxes. I don't think you (or I) benefit from the check boxes which cover the same ground as the text boxes earlier in the form.

In general the information provided to me was very good and allowed me to review all relevant modules adequately. However, it would be helpful, in addition to student work and mark sheets to have printouts of student feedback for each module. This was present in a couple of cases and was very helpful in allowing me to understand the student experience of a module.

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):

BMS10101 Forensic Toxicology
 BMS09102 Forensic Analysis
 BMS10100 Forensic Genetics & DNA Profiling
 BMS10105 Case File Interpretation and Court Room Evidence
 BMS09104 Aspects of Forensic Biology
 BMS09106 Analytical and Forensic Science
 BMS09107 Law, Statistics and Reporting in Forensic Science
 ENV10100 Honours Project

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>	✓	
<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	

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>N/A - As I do not work in academia, I am not in a position to compare the standards of work with other higher education 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>Yes</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>BMS09104 Aspects of Forensic Biology – Generally low marks were obtained in the exam predominantly due to the students not answering the questions. Higher marks were obtained in the Journal logs.</p> <p>BMS09106 Analytical and Forensic Science – Lab books were good, however, students lost marks in the exam.</p> <p>BMS09102 Forensic Analysis – Generally low marks, particularly in the exam and court report.</p> <p>BMS09107 Law, Statistics and Reporting in Forensic Science - Overall, students gained low marks, although a few students performed well in the first essay. Marks were particularly low for the poster and oral presentations. I understand that the module leader is looking into different ways to improve the performance for the poster assignment and to provide more support for the students.</p> <p>Overall, lower marks were obtained for the level 9 modules this year. In general, there appeared to be a lack of further reading/in-depth knowledge of various topics and this was evident in the exam performances.</p>

BMS10100 Forensic Genetics & DNA Profiling – 100% of students passed this module this year compared with 66% last year which I think reflects the fact that the students took an alternative assessment rather than an exam and learning logs were marked slightly higher than the previous year.

BMS10101 Forensic Toxicology – Good pass rate in this module and it is evident that students enjoyed it. Students did very well in the tender document but obtained slightly lower marks in the exam. This may have been down to the students spending less time preparing for the exam whilst concentrating on the tender document.

BMS10105 Case File Interpretation and Court Room Evidence – Generally students performed well in this module.

ENV10100 Honours Project – The majority of students produced good projects and had obviously paid attention to the clear guidance provided to them. However, in some projects there were a few basic errors including the tense used.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

It is evident that the module leaders and staff work hard to provide students with the best possible environment and skills for the future. I think all of the teaching methods employed in all the modules work well and help students to develop a wide range of skills.

The students clearly enjoyed and benefitted from the guest speakers in both the Forensic Genetics and DNA Profiling module and the Case File Interpretation and Court Room Evidence module. I do think that the Forensic Genetics and DNA Profiling module covers one of the most difficult topics of Forensic biology and think that the course would benefit from an input from someone with knowledge of this area of Forensic biology.

BMS09104 Aspects of Forensic Biology - The journal logs that the students complete are a good way of demonstrating further reading and may be helpful in other modules where students do not do this of their own accord.

Learning logs were also a very useful way of determining whether students understand a particular topic.

BMS10105 Case File Interpretation and Court Room Evidence - The court report and court appearance are excellent ways to prepare students for what to expect as a Forensic Scientist. In the meeting with students, we discussed that a mock court, possibly using the Report produced in the previous year, might help prepare students for their court appearance in this module. Students also commented that they were told to complete examination sheets in the lab differently to a previous module taught by another lecturer. This may be something that could be standardised between modules.

BMS09107 Law, Statistics and Reporting in Forensic Science - Students generally appeared

to struggle with the poster in the module. As discussed above, this aspect is likely to change next year.

ENV10100 Honours Project - It appeared that students were given excellent guidance for their Honours Projects as the majority were well laid out and clearly written. The statistics used were fit for purpose and not overly complicated. However, as for last year, the students stated that they did not feel sufficiently prepared for this aspect of their project and said that they would benefit from an extra tutorial(s) in statistics. Students also felt they needed some further assistance with their proposal and ethics forms.

5) Assessment

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

In the main, I found the marking of assessments and feedback provided fair and clear.

BMS10105 Case File Interpretation and Court Room Evidence – In the discussion with the students, it was highlighted that they would have benefitted from some feedback on their report prior to their court appearance.

BMS10100 Forensic Genetics and DNA Profiling module - As stated above, there was an obvious increase in the marks, which I think reflects the fact that the students took an alternative assessment rather than an exam and learning logs were marked slightly higher than the previous year. This is unlikely to be an issue in future years.

ENV10100 Honours projects – In general, similar marks were given by each assessor. One of the areas where assessors seemed to vary most widely was the standard of English/spelling, although this did not overly affect the final score, as it only contributed 5% of the marks. I felt this area could be a bit more standardised. However, I am aware that this is likely to change next year.

This year the mark for performance was not included in the overall mark as last year it was noted that this mark could unfairly influence the overall mark and the mark itself was not moderated. However, this year there was a concern for students who worked extremely hard in their project but did not do as well in their project write up. I understand that there may be other ways to take this into account and that this is being discussed for future years.

6) Good practice

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

It was particularly useful to receive some of the module work prior to attending for the module board, particularly the modules (BMS09107 & BMS10105) which included the court appearances and oral presentations.

The meeting with the final year students in January was a good way of finding out how the course was going and whether there were any particular issues the students felt needed to be addressed. The format of this year's meeting worked well.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

BMS10105 – Case File Interpretation and Court Room Evidence – Consider a mock court to help prepare students for their court appearance.

BMS10100 Forensic Genetics & DNA Profiling – Continue to include guest speakers and include a forensic input into the course to ensure a sound understanding of match probabilities and likelihood ratios.

ENV10100 Honours projects - Consider a tutorial(s) in statistics for Forensic Biology students.

Consider whether journal logs completed by students in the Aspects of Forensic Biology Module would be useful in 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

✓		
✓		
✓		
✓		

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).

Reviewing the work was made much easier this year by the module descriptors, assessment briefs and marking criteria that I was given. Any suggestions that I had made previously were taken on board.

As I found last year, the staff worked very hard to get the best from the students. The coursework is very relevant and provides students with many essential skills for the future.

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):

SSC09108	Crime, Control and Punishment	DR LIZ ASTON
SSC09113	Violence and Society	DR MARY-LOUISE CORR
SSC10107	Comparative & International Criminology	DR KATRINA MORRISON
SSC10112	Surveillance & Society	DR SIMON LANE/Grant Jeffery
SSC10113	Victimisation and Victimology	DR MARY-LOUISE CORR
SSC10106	Honours Project	Geraldine Jones

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.

The work is easily comparable – some excellent work displayed

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 – no issues arising.

3) Student Performance

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

Again excellent – and reflects the quality of teaching, student support and engagement which is evident in the criminology modules I moderated.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

5) Assessment

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

Good range of assessment methods, detailed assessment criteria given to students. My only observation would be that your assessment load seems heavy in comparison to my own institution and others that I am familiar with. Staff and students seem to manage this, but possibly worth considering the volume of assessments across programmes

6) Good practice

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

Feedback on some modules excellent and extensive

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 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?
- 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?

MEB only		
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 am continually impressed by all my interactions with the criminology provision at Napier; but it has to be said that this is based on very stretched and limited staffing base. The excellence in terms of student experience is outstanding; but this cannot be sustained without further staffing so that the curriculum can be supported appropriately - variety in specialism / expertise particularly re honours project supervision – in line with the subject benchmarks; and the burden on staff addressed.

Currently I feel that the quality displayed – for example - level of detail of feedback to students and the overall student experience - relies on the goodwill of staff. I cannot see how this can be sustained at current staffing levels. For similar level of provision we would have approximately seven FTE. This may be beyond my remit to comment but this is an excellent programme that needs to be celebrated and supported.

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

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 work displayed in each of the modules I dealt with were wholly appropriate and equivalent to standards in other universities.

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 all offered the opportunity for students to show high-level analytical skills and to engage with a range of theoretical and empirical frameworks.

3) Student Performance

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

The best students were able to show extensive knowledge of the topics covered and to place the issues in a wider context. They were able to engage with broad social science concepts and this gained appropriate reward.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

The quality of feedback provided to students was very high, and should enable students to profit from the commentary on their work. The results of the modules indicates that learning and teaching methods are effective and sound.

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 was conducted with exemplary quality. Student work was assessed with great thoroughness and care, and the module assessment board provided a good opportunity for discussion of student performance and the overall format of modules.

6) Good practice

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

Exemplary statistical information and constructive discussion of broad issues at the module board.

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?
- 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 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):

- BMS11100 Advanced Immunology**
- BMS11101 Biology of Disease and Therapeutics**
- BMS11110 Molecular Pharmacology and Toxicology**
- MIC11107 Research Skills Molecular Analysis**
- MIC11108 Biotechnology and Drug Discovery**
- BMS11102 Research Project (shared with other Externals)**
- BMS11603 Scientific Skills (International)**
- BMS11605 Toxicology and Pathology**
- BMS11604 Applied Medical Microbiology**
- BMS11601 Haematology and Transfusion Science**
- BMS11606 Immunotechnology**
- BMS11602 Biomedical Applications of Molecular Biology**
- BMS11607 Research Project**

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

MSc Biomedical Science Hong Kong

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 am very happy that the work presented was of a standard comparable to that seen at other institutions within the UK that I am familiar with.

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 standards of the modules and programme were very appropriate for the degree. It is my opinion that they are wholly consistent with both benchmark and level statements.

3) Student Performance

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

There was a wider range of ability in the student body than I have encountered for a long time. Some pieces of work were of extraordinary quality, but there were others where the ability of the candidates to articulate their arguments was very poor, either for want of ability in written English or lack of sufficient subject specific knowledge or skill. I had the opportunity to discuss some of these cases with the teaching team (see good practice below), and I am satisfied that the students had sufficient opportunity to achieve grades that were warranted by their ability and effort.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

I did not have the opportunity to examine these first hand, but by having the opportunity to access the Virtual Learning Environment; to discuss the teaching and learning with Staff; and identify the outcomes of assessment, it is my opinion that they are fit for purpose. I was also offered the opportunity to meet with students, but I was unable to attend. One concern is the staff time needed to deliver a complex program of post-graduate teaching and learning, having multiple dates of entry and including within it extended practical projects is very challenging. It is a testament to the staff that they can manage this effectively.

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 very impressed by the diversity of modes of assessment , which were wholly appropriate for the modules and programme I considered. As commented on above, I am happy that the outcomes achieved reflected the ability and effort of the students. There were a couple of areas that I queried with the teaching team.

Firstly, some open ended questions had marking schemes that demanded very specific answers. Had I personally been required to answer those questions in an exam, I would have provided answers which would, in my opinion, have directly addressed the question, but which would have achieved very low marks according to the marking schemes provided. This in itself is not a problem. Patently, the expectation of the markers is informed by the teaching and learning on the course – not any experience which I, individually, may have accumulated elsewhere. The key issue is that the expectation of the marker as to what is required and the expectation of the student as to what merits a good answer is aligned. Having had the chance to discuss these cases with the teaching (and marking) team, I am happy that the students have had the opportunity to understand what, specifically, might be required of them in questions such as the ones I considered. However, I would encourage the team to continue to reflect carefully in the teaching , learning and assessment to ensure that this clarity of expectation is communicated to students.

Secondly, the nature of the dissertation process is such that the students submit part of the dissertation, on which the supervisor provides interim feedback (and a mark) . The student's work can be revised, and this revised work then forms part of the final dissertation that I read. I have no problem with this. However, since I do not see any intermediate work, only the final product, I can only consider what that final piece of work warrants. In a couple of cases, the internal markers had awarded the final dissertation a mark harsher than one I would have ordinarily given on face value of that final product. On discussion with the markers, they assured me that a substantive part of the dissertations concerned were very,

very heavily informed by the significant feedback provided by the supervisors at the interim point, and as such the input of the student beyond that was comparatively modest. Having had that discussion, I am comfortable that the marks awarded do indeed reflect the ability and effort of the student, but it does make it difficult to assess this independently. I would encourage the teaching team to make more explicit the level of support provided when justifying the marks they award.

6) Good practice

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

- 1) The written narrative provided by the module leaders was very helpful in understanding the context of the teaching, learning and assessment strategies in place. I would encourage my home institution to take this on board as a service to our own externals.
- 2) In almost every case, there was a good written commentary on the exam scripts, which enabled me to see where the marks were coming from. The very small number where this was not as clear thus stood out all the more.
- 3) A very clear set of marking notes/model answers for every module. This enabled me to have high confidence in the consistency of marking. Marking notes which are explicit and potentially exclusive can however come with their own problems (see recommendations)
- 4) The opportunity to meet and discuss individual modules with the module leaders. Coupled with the written narrative, this helped me have confidence in the assessment strategies, and gave me good contextual information to be able to take an informed view on outcomes.
- 5) The meetings I have attended have been very efficiently run, and it was clear that all staff present had the opportunity to speak and raise issues of concern relating to the students.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

- 1) that the teaching staff just reflect on marking schemes which demand very specific answers to open ended questions. This might be by assuring themselves that the students have a full understanding of what is expected –and not expected - in terms of subject specific knowledge required prior to examination, or it might be by considering marking schemes which could accommodate a correct answer produced by an argument which had not been anticipated.
- 2) That the markers of the dissertations be as explicit as possible in outlining the level of support provided by the supervisor in the production of the dissertation.
- 3) That the University reflects on the utility of the generic mark classification (i.e. F1, P2 etc.). No mark classification scheme is perfect, but the one that Napier has adopted as institutional policy is one of the most obtuse that I have ever encountered. A plea for a simple numeric mark, perhaps?

--

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).

Just to complement the staff for their very warm welcome and assistance in helping me discharge my responsibilities.

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	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):

MIC11100
MIC11102
MIC11103
MIC11104
MIC11110
MIC11111
MIC11112

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.

A range of standards was visible and these were comparable between the two modules that I assessed. The standards were comparable to those in other institutions I have worked in.

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 believe the academic standard is being considered, set and maintained at the appropriate level, thus meeting the academic standards.

3) Student Performance

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

There was the expected balance of student performance in their module assessments, with some failing, most passing and just a few excelling. On the Biotechnology for Sustainable Renewables module, the exam papers showed particularly modest-poor scores – can the module leader consider how this can be improved?

4) Learning and Teaching

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

A good range of L&T methods have been employed in the modules.

I spent quite a bit of time looking at the new modules Environmental Sustainability Management and Biotechnology for Sustainable Renewables. Firstly I commend the lecturer for setting up two excellent modules and running them smoothly. The content and implementation looks very good. There is a good mix of teaching methods and assessment types, building generic and subject specific skills. There was a reasonably good set of grades with a good pass rate. It was good to see students contributing to experimental design of classes, especially after holding a workshop on experimental design. Good to see assessment for critical analysis; feedback was excellent.

5) Assessment

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

The feedback is excellent across the board for modules and projects alike. Feedback is detailed and constructive. I thought the assessments of the projects was quite variable, partly based on expectations of some staff that a project should fit to particular prescriptive ideals (eg an introduction should be of a certain length, so students seemed to be marked down if it wasn't longer). However, it became clear after I requested the guidelines for the project writeup that there is no set length or format. I feel that setting a word limit would be helpful to both staff and students in understanding the expectations. Additionally, I would suggest the staff provide an example of a very good and a very bad project write up to the students so that they are fully aware of what is expected; this could be discussed with each student either via tutors or project supervisors. I also noted that the score sheets do not have a section for being able to summarise the feedback into a form that aligns well with the marking criteria, this should be changed. Finally, the new change in the module descriptor states that students must pass all three components of their projects, but how could a student "resit" their project proposal and lab performance – this needs to be clarified?

A comment on the grading system. I (and my colleague external examiners) find the current grading system to be incredibly difficult to follow, counterintuitive and confusing. Also, it really isn't clear how grades are determined – this is not at all a transparent process. Discussion with Napier staff indicated they find it very time consuming to work with this system and students don't like it. It is unclear to me why Napier uses this system over the tried and tested % grading system that is used by almost all HEI. My advice would be for the staff to request a change in the system.

6) Good practice

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

Good breadth of assessment types including data interpretation, essays, presentations (posters) and critical analysis.

Outstanding feedback given to the students.

Biotechnology for Sustainable Renewables is doing site visits, which the students liked.

Students say staff are friendly and approachable, thus good at building a rapport

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

Change grading system (see point 5, above)

Set word limit on project dissertations

Provide a good and bad project for all students to see to help them understand how to structure the reports correctly

Introduce a summary section for project score sheets

Update the module descriptor to indicate how students re-sit all three project components in the event of a fail.

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		

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).

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):

CRG11108 Communities, Networks and partnerships
 CRG11102 Professional Practice 2
 CRG Advanced Professional practice
 CRG11105 Labour Market Studies
 CRG 11103 Policy and Organisations

CRG 11109 Social Research Skills for Career Education and Guidance
 CRG11100 Dissertation

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

Pg Dip Career Guidance and Development

MSc Career Guidance (top up)

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 an acceptable range in the standard of work within each module and between taught and distance learning students. This reflects the nature of the student body; many being mature students who have not been in education for some time. It is completely comparable with other HEIs I am familiar with who offer similar programmes. It should be noted however that at the higher end of that range, some of the work I have seen is inspiring and of an excellent standard that I would hope would proceed further onto perhaps doctoral level study.

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 of each of the modules I have seen are at the appropriate academic level. The feedback and marks awarded have been clearly and thoughtfully considered against these standards and the internal processes to maintain these standards are transparent and rigorous.

3) Student Performance

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

I have not observed any general weaknesses across the modules that could be ascribed to learning and teaching approaches. However it is clear that the expectations of tutors are high and that students have the scope to develop innovative ideas that relate to practice.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

I have seen work from both taught and distance learning students. Standards of learning and teaching are clearly maintained across both these groups which should be commended as this is not a simple thing to achieve. Students are clearly challenged, encouraged and supported in their understanding of theoretical considerations and enabled to relate these to practice.

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 been very impressed by the internal moderation of assessment. It is transparent, candid and thoughtful. I have been made aware of those assessments on borderlines of pass/fail and how judgements have been made and discussed among the team.

6) Good practice

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

As indicated above I have been particularly impressed with the way in which students' work is assessed; feedback meticulously referring to learning outcomes and marking criteria. The internal moderation is also taken very seriously and carefully exercised within a supportive but demanding environment.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

This is my first year of external examination and I have no recommendations to make based on this year's experience. Unfortunately I was not able to attend the exam board in person but hope to do so next year and look forward to getting to know the programme even better so that if appropriate I will be able to make some constructive recommendations next 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

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 was my first year externally examining this programme and my first at Edinburgh Napier. My experience has been positive and I am very happy to submit this very positive report. The professional body (CDI) standards are adhered to.

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 2012/13

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 2012/13 are

- 05 July 2013 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 26 October 2013 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	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):

BMS11104 Current Practice in Drug Development
BMS11109 Current Topics in Pharmaceutical Science
BMS11105 Drug Design and Chemotherapy
BMS11102 Research Project

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

MSc Pharmaceutical Science F/P/T
MSc BiotechnologF/T P/T
MSc Biomedical Science F/T P/T
MSc Drug Design and Biomedical Science F/T P/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>	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 confirm that the standards of student work I observed at Napier compare favourably with other institutions offering MSc degrees (including my own). As I mentioned last year, this is all the more impressive because a number of students attempting the Drug Design and Chemo module come from non-Chemistry backgrounds.

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 standard of the modules for which I am responsible clearly meet SCQF level descriptors for Level 11 (Masters). There is clear evidence of high level skills including critical thinking and evaluation.

3) Student Performance

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

For this visit, I had the opportunity to review 3 of the MSc projects. The projects involved the synthesis and biological evaluation of legumain – specific conjugates of anthraquinones. This is a well established research area for the respective Academics and the projects were of an appropriate standard. I read the projects 'blind' and I would have ranked them differently to the internal assessors, but the differences in grade for these students were very small and I am happy to accept the marks of the internal staff. The 3 projects were well presented and structures and data were drawn and presented to a high standard. Given the time constraints of MSc projects, it's good to see biological evaluation included in the projects (cell culture, enzyme assays, etc.). While I was at Napier, I was asked to read another project. This was a much poorer effort and I found it hard to follow. The student's Intro and review of the field was lacking in detail (although it was very long) and he/she didn't understand the modes of intercalation of drugs into DNA. There was no chemical synthesis to report, all compounds were supplied by the chemists at Napier, so the experimental part of the project was essentially the growing of some MCF7 cells and cytotoxicity testing of the supplied compounds. Some attempt was made to produce a SAR for the compounds by relating IC50 values to the number of phenolic OHs in the rings, but this was limited in scope. This project could have benefited from one further read through although it seems from discussions with colleagues at Napier, that this student has already

received considerable support from staff. I can confirm that a grade of P4 is appropriate for this student.

In the course of discussions with staff, it appears that they have been asked to turnaround the MSc project marks in a very short period of time (4 or 5 days?). This seems to me to be quite a short time to assess SCQF 11 material adequately and could lead to mistakes in assessment. I wonder if the university calendar could be 'tweaked' to allow the staff more time (at least a week?) to fully consider and assess the work.

In my last report, I commented on the 'counter intuitive' nature of the grading scheme used for MSc courses at Napier (P1, D3 etc.). I received a response to my comments which did not change my view in any way. I think MSc projects in this area should be marked using a % scheme and combined arithmetically where required. If the final mark has to be converted into a letter at the end, then so be it, but I would be reassured if all calculations were carried out on real numbers rather than median values and grouped grade descriptors. I am happy to provide examples of what we do at RGU if that would help.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

Evidence from the projects I read suggests T&L to be appropriate (although see 3 above). I understand a wide range of teaching methods and assessment formats is used on the MScs and this is to be applauded.

5) Assessment

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

See comments above concerning grade descriptors.

6) Good practice

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

I received the projects in good time and the staff I met were happy to discuss issues openly.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

I have no specific recommendations other than to urge Napier to adopt a numerical marking system, rather than grouped grade descriptors.

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?
- 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).

N/A

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 2012/13

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 2012/13 are

- 05 July 2013 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 26 October 2013 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):

BMS11104 Current Practice in Drug Development
BMS11109 Current Topics in Pharmaceutical Science
BMS11105 Drug Design and Chemotherapy
BMS11102 Research Project

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

MSc Pharmaceutical Science F/P/T
MSc BiotechnologF/T P/T
MSc Biomedical Science F/T P/T
MSc Drug Design and Biomedical Science F/T P/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>	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 confirm that the standards of student work I observed at Napier compare favourably with other institutions offering MSc degrees (including my own). As I mentioned last year, this is all the more impressive because a number of students attempting the Drug Design and Chemo module come from non-Chemistry backgrounds.

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 standard of the modules for which I am responsible clearly meet SCQF level descriptors for Level 11 (Masters). There is clear evidence of high level skills including critical thinking and evaluation.

3) Student Performance

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

The examination was, in general, well done, and resulted in 4 fails. I reviewed these papers and confirm the fails are genuine and irretrievable. There was a suspicion of 'question spotting' in that one question was avoided completely and 2 other questions were very popular. It would be interesting to see the average score for each question, to see if there was any difference in rigour of marking.

The C/W exercise was challenging and involved students coming to terms with the basic 'nuts and bolts' of Medicinal Chemistry by synthesising and purifying Anticancer drugs (a subject close to my own heart). In general, this lab exercise was well done and this is reflected in good marks for the students.

The Projects I reviewed were appropriate to the subject and clearly at M level. Some high marks were awarded, but these were deserved and I am pleased to see staff employing the extremes of the marking scale, where appropriate.

On Tuesday pm the EEs had the opportunity to meet a number of students. This event went well and the students spoke highly of the university, their course and the staff. There was some complaints about the timing of feedback (!) and one student requested he receive the C/W assessment feedback before the exam, but otherwise it went well. I thought the 5

students we met were articulate and intelligent young people, and a credit to the University. We met for about an hour and the time passed quickly.

I must admit, I for one find Napier's grading system to be cumbersome and I usually stick to %. I understand from colleagues that the Assessment Board program uses the median number appropriate to the grade band in question, to calculate results and Honours classifications. If this is the case, I wonder why the system doesn't just use actual numbers at all stages of the assessment process

4) Learning and Teaching

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

Evidence from the projects I read suggests T&L to be appropriate. I understand a wide range of teaching methods and assessment formats is used on the MScs and this is to be applauded.

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 I observed were fair and rigorous and the Assessment Board was conducted fairly and openly. I felt that each student had been carefully considered and given every opportunity to shine.

6) Good practice

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

I received the draft papers and projects in good time and the staff I met were happy to take on board my comments.
This year, the Externals again met with a small number of students. This was a useful session and allowed the EEs to hear student concerns and views of the course. As I stated above, the students we met were a credit to the university and spoke very highly of the staff and their course. There was a small moan about the timing of Feedback, but this is an endemic problem in the HE sector.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

I have no specific recommendations other than to urge you to keep the meeting with students.
As I said above, I am old fashioned (and a scientist!) so find it easier to work with actual numbers than grade descriptors, but the staff are very patient and explain the Napier system to me at the Board.

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?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?

X		
		X
X		

- 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		

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).

N/A

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):

SES11100 Applied Biomechanics - Performance Enhancement

SES11101 Psychological Interventions in Sports Performance Enhancement

SES11102 Physiological Factors Affecting Sports Performance

SES11103 Scientific study in sport

SES 11104 Contemporary Issues in Sport and Exercise Science

SES11105 Independent Study (40 credits)

SES11106 Independent Study (20 credits)

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

MSc Sports Performance Enhancement F/T

MSc Sports Performance Enhancement P/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.

This academic year I have viewed work across a broad range of standards. The marking is appropriate for the quality of work submitted. Over my tenure as External Examiner there has been a steady development in the quality of the work produced by students. In my opinion the standard of the provision is comparable with Masters level provision in other institutions. The standard of student work appeared to be consistent and comparable across the range of modules on offer. I would re-iterate previous comments, that where work is of a high calibre staff should not be afraid to use the full range of marks.

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 set within each module is good. I have found the staff team to be very proactive in maintaining standards and seeking to develop each module. During the year there have been some very productive discussions with members of the staff team.

Last year I commented that some of the marking by junior staff might have been a little harsh compared to more senior colleagues. This does not seem to be the case this year, however there were some issues on the dissertation module. In the projects that I viewed not all of them were viable. This was either due to a weakness in the design or an over ambitious design. These projects were supervised by more junior staff and in a similar manner to my comments last year perhaps a mentoring system for these staff should be introduced. Furthermore, not all of the projects were on areas fitting with the ethos of the degree. Staff ought to review this module considering what constitute suitable topics. Moreover, they should also consider whether other, more applied, projects are appropriate. Perhaps links could be made with NGBs or extended single subject designs?

3) Student Performance

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

Overall, the student performance was good. Increasingly there has been an improvement in the evidence base to student work. Staff should be commended for their persistent efforts over the past few years to improve this aspect of the programme. This investment is now beginning to reap dividends.

<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>This continues to be an area of particular strength and staff should be commended. The modules are well constructed, with a wide variety of teaching methods employed. Staff appear to be diligent in all aspects of pedagogy. Students appreciate the opportunity to conduct real life support work and this is also an invaluable experience for them. This coupled with the staff expertise provide an excellent learning and teaching environment.</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>An extensive range of assessment tools are employed across the programme of study. These assessments are fair and rigorously applied. The feedback to students is extensive and clear guidance on areas for improvement are given.</p> <p>There has been a much need improvement in the level of second marking has this year, however the documentation still remains weak in places.</p>
<p>6) Good practice Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extensive feedback provided to students. • The practical opportunities provided as part of the student learning experience. • There continual critical reflection on the course and drive to make improvements.
<p>7) Recommendations Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.</p>
<p>Review of the dissertation module.</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).

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	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):

1. Policy and Organisations CRG11103
2. Careers Related Information and Learning CRG 1104 / CRG 11118
3. Professional Practice 2 CRG 11102 / CRG 11116
4. Labour Market Studies CRG 11105 / CRG 11115

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.

All the assessments I saw had requested from the students and been tested with, the appropriate rigour I would expect from this level of study. While there was an expected range of student attainment within the samples of work, I believe the standard across the cohort was good and comparable.

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 being set are appropriate for both the academic and professional requirements required. Testing of a range of skills and knowledge undertaken, matching well the requirements for potential success within the profession following qualification.

3) Student Performance

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

Given the range of performance noted, generally the students showed a consistent level of good performance across the modules.

Given the variety of skill sets and understanding being assessed this was good.

From undertaking interviewing to producing careers / industry related materials for presentation to groups of pupils/students, performance was good.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

Academic input, group working, individual practical work all blended together to provide a range of appropriate learning and teaching methods.

5) Assessment

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

Always difficult given the nature of some of the work being undertaken, thinking specifically about individual interviewing skills, to ensure fairness and rigour.

Course does this well, concentrating on how the students handle the situation(s) as presented, focussing on their skill and knowledge development. Useful and supportive feedback offered.

6) Good practice

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

1. Policy and Organisations: Interesting assignment – Essay focussing on gender issues. Given range of issues possible within policy dev't this requirement, in order to remain focussed almost necessitated a wider understanding too. Useful in engaging a wider thinking by linking an understanding of issues of policy to the provision of guidance.
2. Careers Related Information and Learning: Good assignment in designing a Careers Education programme focusses thinking on not just what to include and how, but WHY? This was evident especially with the better assignments.
3. Professional Practice 2: Recording of interviews and full and honest but supportive feedback is excellent. Self-assessment element also a useful tool for encouraging reflective practice.
4. Labour Market Studies: Occupational knowledge is an area which can become overlooked given the breadth of other professional techniques and practice. The importance of the labour market studies module in liaising with industry is good.

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).

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