

School of Marketing Tourism and Languages

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):

TSM09102 Planning and Public Policy for F&E

TSM09902 Planning and Public Policy for F&E (Hong Kong)

TSM09122 Supervised Work Experience

TSM09121 Employability Skills and Attributes

TSM09908 Event Management (Hong Kong)

TSM09107 Live Project – Hospitality, Marketing, Tourism and Festival and Events

TSM09907 Live Project (Hong Kong) – Marketing and Events cohorts

TSM09117 Management of MICE Events

TSM09917 Management of MICE Events (Hong Kong)

TSM10107 Leadership and Innovation for Tsm, Hosp and Events – part time and full time

TSM10103 International Festival and Event Environments

TSM10930 Dissertation – shared

TSM10133 Dissertation proposal

BM09908 Event Management (HK space)

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

BA (Hons) Festival & Event Mgt

BA (Hons) F&E and Hospitality Mgt

BA (Hons) F&E and Marketing Mgt

BA (Hons) F&E and Tourism Mgt

BA (Hons) F&E Mgt with Entrepreneurship

BA (Hons) F&E Mgt with HRM

BA (Hons) F&E Mgt with Language

BA (Hons) F&E Studies

BA (Hons) F&E Mgt (Hong Kong) (F/T)

BA (Hons) F&E Mgt (Hong Kong) (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>	yes	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	yes	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	yes	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	yes	

Section C:

<p>1) Comparability Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.</p>
<p>In the main, there is clear evidence of internal moderation and the standard across modules is comparable. The pack of information provided by module leaders, whilst variable is comprehensive and fully facilitates the moderation process. The exceptions are the Live Projects (Marketing HK and Tourism Hospitality, Festivals and Events) as there is some discrepancy between Hong Kong and Edinburgh marking and there are inconsistencies in marks awarded for part time and full time cohorts on the Leadership and Innovation module.</p> <p>The standards are comparable to 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>Standards in the main, are being met and maintained at the appropriate level as per subject benchmark statements and SCQF descriptors. The modules requiring some attention to further ensure this are those delivered in Hong Kong, Leadership and Innovation and the Live Project.</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>With regards to strengths, the teaching team clearly are committed to support and develop students and this is a key strength. The team in their curriculum and assessment design allow students to excel and allow stronger students to 'stand out'. The industry links and applied real world case studies are strengths of the programme such as the Live Project, Supervised Work Experience and Planning and Public Policy for Festivals and Events. The programme content presents a good balance between academic context and theory, and the 'real world' of festivals and events and opportunities for the enhancing of their employability.</p> <p>Students did not do as well within some exams and there is an opportunity for module leaders to reflect upon exam paper formats and the need to develop students appropriately to be able to write essays and cope with exams. Students were weak with regards to quantitative data analysis as noted in the dissertation and the level was rather</p>

simple for final year students. The use of only mixed method approaches in the sample was perplexing and worrying as students should be more discerning as mixed methods will not suit all research projects. There were also inconsistencies in the approaches to the writing of aim and objectives, which could be confusing for students. Consistent guidelines are required regarding the appropriate level of quantitative data analysis and the writing of aims and objectives.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

This is exemplary and there is sufficient well designed assessments to distinguish between those high achieving students and those less capable. The assessment is varied and challenging and innovative and allows for clear differentiation and development of necessary skills and knowledge.

5) Assessment

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

There are some excellent examples of exceptional levels of feedback being provided to the students. There have been occasions when marks have been amended for the cohort but that has been fully documented and rationalised and supported by myself. The consistent use of the marking summary sheet would be good as this was not always present with the samples sent for review. With the larger units, this has proven more challenging to ensure but clear evidenced attempts to ensure fairness and rigour was present with Live Projects but not so evident with Leadership and Innovation for THE, where there was a very large sample size and varying levels and volume of feedback from the different markers.

6) Good practice

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

Good practice is evident in the following aspects:

The level of feedback and support given to the students and the varied, interesting and challenging range of assessments.

The opportunity for industry engagement with the Live Project and the Supervised Work Experience modules.

The comprehensive packs of information sent for review and the marking summary sheet and full disclosure of spread of marks.

The administrative support and the willingness of module leaders to engage in dialogue and open responses to any queries raised.

The commitment of the team in delivering the modules and ensuring they are informed by real world examples.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

There are still recommendations from last year, which I am unsure how they have been met. From reviewing the work, they would seem to have been resolved but there needs to be a clearer and more transparent feeding back process from module leaders in response to individual comment sheets and also the external examiner report.

The information provided with the samples was variable and it is recommended that the contents of the information presented is standardised and that there is consistent use of the marking summary sheet.

To reflect upon the dissertation and the appropriateness of the mixed method approach and to ensure students have necessary skills developed to engage in appropriate level of quantitative analysis.

With regards to larger modules such as Dissertation and Leadership and Innovation there needs to be a transparent and clearer documented process of standardisation and marks moderation.

There are still study skill gaps for the students and notably that of academic underpinning to academic work and exam skills.

Section D:

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

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

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

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

YES		
YES		
YES		
YES		

Draft Examination Papers

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

YES		
YES		
YES		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

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

YES		
YES		
YES		

Dissertations/Project reports

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

YES		
-----	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

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

YES		
YES		
	NO	

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	√

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

Module No.	Module Title	Trimester Taught
	Food and Beverage Management (Hong Kong)	2
TSM09101	Hospitality Business Development	1
TSM09106	Food and Wine in Society	1
TSM09106	International Wine & Spirits Management	2
TSM09111	Hospitality Supervision and Training Skills	1
TSM09120	Work Experience (Hospitality)	2
TSM09123	Hospitality Consultancy Project (India)	1
TSM09501	Hospitality Business Development (Glasgow Met)	2
TSM09505	Hospitality Industry Project (Glasgow Met)	2
TSM09771	Hospitality Business Development (Switzerland)	1
TSM09775	Hospitality Industry Project (Switzerland)	2
TSM09801	Hospitality Business Development (India)	2
TSM09811	Hospitality Supervision and Training Skills (India)	1
TSM09901	Hospitality Business Development (Hong Kong)	1
TSM09906	International Wine & Spirits Mgt (Hong Kong)	2
TSM10101	International Hospitality	2

TSM10130	Dissertation - shared	1,2
TSM10901	International Hospitality (Hong Kong)	2
TSM10930	Dissertation (Hong Kong) - shared	1,2

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

Programme Duties

PROGRAMME CODE	PROGRAMME TITLE	PROGRAMME LEADER
34201BH	Ba (Hons) Hospitality Mgt	Dr Ahmed Hassanien
34202BH	Ba (Hons) Hospitality and Marketing Mgt	Dr Ahmed Hassanien
34203BH	Ba (Hons) Hospitality and Tourism Mgt	Dr Ahmed Hassanien
34204BH	Ba (Hons) Hospitality Mgt with Entrepreneurship	Dr Ahmed Hassanien
34205BH	Ba (Hons) Hospitality Mgt with HRM	Dr Ahmed Hassanien
34206BH	Ba (Hons) Hospitality Mgt with Language	Dr Ahmed Hassanien
34207BH	Ba (Hons) Hospitality Studies	Dr Ahmed Hassanien
	BA (Hons) Hospitality and Service Mgt (Hong Kong)	Michael Herriott
	BA (Hons) Hospitality Mgt (India)	Pauline Gordon
	BA (Hons) International Hospitality Mgt (Switzerland)	Dr Ros Sutherland
	BA Hospitality Mgt (Inter-National)	Stephen Taylor

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 work is of comparable standards to other higher education institutions I am familiar with.

I made the comment in the exam board that some of the overseas centres have been challenging in terms of comparable standards with Napier home students. I commend the module leaders, who in some instances have re-marked cohorts or agreed wholesale mark changes. I have read the scripts and I fully support the changes made by module leaders. My concern is that despite the best efforts of Napier staff responsible for overseas staff development, it has been possible for a few overseas staff to miss the training or fail to understand the necessary standards. Referencing seems to be the most challenging area.

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 considered the standards for both the modules and programmes of study to be of a high level. I am regularly informed of any major or minor changes and I have built a good rapport with the module leaders. The standards set meet the requirements set out in subject benchmark statements and 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

Student's performances are similar to other institutions. I am pleased to report that staff are prepared to give 80% plus marks where appropriate. Sometimes staff members are reluctant to ever mark above 72%. I saw a range of marks from 88% to 8%.

I was unable to meet with any students this year which is a pity. I will plan to meet with student's next February 2015 visit.

The quality of work with the partner in Glasgow is of a very high standard and this year more students will top up to honours degrees. Some centres have a higher failure rate and issues with plagiarism and collusion remain an issue in some centres. I support the grades given. Napier is working hard to eradicate plagiarism and the students are given very clear guidelines with all assessments. As I pointed out earlier, it has been hard work for some module leaders who have had to remark work.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

A range of teaching methods are employed at all levels. In all cases the module handbooks are very student friendly with excellent advice on how to complete tasks. I commend the module leaders for excellent handbooks. Very supportive help with referencing and how to avoid plagiarism. Examination papers are shown to external examiners in advance and in my opinion all the exam papers I reviewed were appropriate with relevant and challenging questions.

The class sizes are very manageable with students having the opportunity to get to know the tutors and seek advice if necessary.

Programmes delivered in different centres are scrutinised and internally verified by the Napier teaching team. I am confident that module leaders are very careful to check that all centres work to the same high standards.

I did not meet with any students this year to ask their opinions.

5) Assessment

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

All modules have been posted to me for review, including handbooks and student support material. I did suggest last year that perhaps the module handbooks could be scanned to avoid postage. However the system does work well.

In all cases the work has been internally verified pre and post assessment. The internal verifying is carried out by members of Napier staff with some examples of best practice by some lecturers which include detailed and typed feedback to the first marker.

Feedback is generally very good with summative comments typed, easy to read and informative comments throughout the text. I did see one poor example where an overseas tutor gave a mark of 8/10 for referencing when the student had not referenced at all. I am pleased to say this was picked up by the module leader.

The quality of the feedback from module leaders is exceptionally good in some instances.

6) Good practice

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

The strong links with Glasgow college and the excellent quality of work.

The quality of feedback from module leaders when internally verifying.

Very good rapport with the lecturers and administration staff.

Very professional board whereby board attendees are able to discuss contentious issues and external examiners are encouraged to comment.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

To work hard to avoid overseas centres allowing poor marking standards. The vast majority of the work is of a high standard.

Maintain and improve the staff development in overseas centres particularly regarding referencing and plagiarism.

Formalise the EE visits to include the opportunity to meet with some students at least once a year.

I suggest a response to external examiners comments from the programme director. It does not have to a long response, but explains how the matters raised will be dealt with. This is the norm in most institutions.

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	

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):

TSM 10108	Airline Management
TSM 10106	Airline Marketing and Management
TSM 10105	Business Tourism
TSM 10133	Dissertation
TSM 09113	Global Airline Industry
TSM 09913	Global Airline Industry (Hong Kong)
TSM 10102	International Destination Management
TSM 09103	International Tourism Policy and Planning

TSM 09104 Service Management
 TSM 09504 Service Management (Glasgow)
 TSM 09774 Service Management (Switzerland)
 TSM 09804 Service Management (India)
 TSM 09904 Service Management (Hong Kong)
 TSM 08106 Visitor Attraction Management

From 2013-14 :

TSM 09905 Service Management (Hong Kong SCOPE)

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

BA Hospitality, Tourism, Festival & Events Management

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:

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 displayed by students in the modules I externally scrutinised continue to

compare favourably with those of courses in other UK universities, with which I am familiar, and they adhere to the national benchmarks for the cognate area. There continues to be academic challenge built into the modules, evident both in the syllabi and in the assessment modes.

The one area of comparability that the team should give consideration to is between the standards in the UK delivery and in its overseas provision, with particular reference to the delivery of one module in Hong Kong. It was apparent that there are disparities in standards between Hong Kong and 'home' module delivery which may require providing further support for the local tutors to obviate issues in student performance. (During this past year I did not see any materials from the India cohorts, so cannot make judgements on these).

Apart from this one issue, I am satisfied that, based on the work seen across a number of modules from the above list, the home and overseas standards continue to 'benchmark' well in the wider academic community.

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 evidence presented to me (module guides and assessments) demonstrated an appropriate set of cognate skills and student development inherent in the design of the syllabi and wider curricula. Despite the issues identified in 1) above, all modules (home and overseas) are designed with attention to rigour and comply with the subject benchmarks for Tourism.

3) Student Performance

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

Nearly all module work presented to me provided a range of student performance, from weak to strong. I can confirm that judgements made in the marking of assessments by the team are fair and appropriate.

In most modules, the stronger students display particularly good skills in academic engagement, critique and investigation, easily comparable with the best standards elsewhere. It was good to see that even middle-range students are displaying their skills effectively, notably evident in some of the 3rd year modules as well as Honours year work.

As alluded to in 1) above, the Hong Kong module in question had a high failure rate in the assessments. In the summative exam, an average mark of 46.4% and a failure rate of almost 24% among a large cohort should trigger the need for internal scrutiny in terms of the management and delivery of the module. (NB - the exam papers were moderated fairly and with due process by the Napier module leader).

4) Learning and Teaching

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

The learning and teaching methods continue to employ and demonstrate good practice, with

employability clearly built in to the design of modules. Business simulations, case study materials and formative presentations are used effectively in a number of the modules scrutinised. Students benefit from the development of appropriate business and management skills, relevant to and transferable across tourism and allied service industry sectors (eg airline, airport and destination management).

The link between programme aims, individual module learning outcomes and module content is well thought through.

5) Assessment

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

I continue to be satisfied with the overall fairness and attention to due process in the marking of assessments. Some modules have very transparent moderation or second marking processes, exemplified in the comments and 'dialogue' evident between markers in reaching agreement on the standards set. There is an issue of comparability here, wherein some modules' internal marking summary sheets there is a 'marks agreed' statement without t comment/qualification by the moderator. Occasionally there is no indication on the exam scripts to suggest how the mark was reached. It may be useful for the team as a whole to discuss approaches to moderation with a view to consistency in practice, given the good practice apparent in many modules.

I was notified that there have been changes to the assessment strategy for the overseas delivery of one particular module, which should impact favourably on the students' performance of the in the future.

6) Good practice

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

There are numerous activities which represent good practice, including :

- very helpful, student focused feedback and 'feed-forward' on quite a few of the module assessment feedback sheets;
- as noted in 5) above, transparent moderation and dialogue between marker and moderator in a number of modules;
- for some modules, analysis of cohort performance, sometimes made available to the students;
- good use of reflectivity in several modules, both formatively and in assessments;
- timeous dispatching of assessment instruments and the assessments for scrutiny throughout the year, effectively reducing the 'end load' on the external examiner.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

The issues with the Hong Kong (SCOPE) delivery (see section 1 above) should be given consideration by the team. Having met with the Napier module leader to discuss the issues prior to the assessment board, I acknowledge that there are particular reasons to account for the disparities in approaches to marking and providing feedback by the local tutors. However, adherence to Napier's practice and standards by local tutors in overseas delivery requires attention.

Where reassessment of examinations is through a second diet paper (as opposed to reworking the original), it would be helpful to receive both first and second diet question

papers at the same time, early in the annual cycle.

Section D:

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

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

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

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

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Draft Examination Papers

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

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

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

Yes*		
Yes		
Mostly		

Dissertations/Project reports

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

Yes*		
------	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

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

Yes		
N/A		
Yes		
Yes		
Partly +		

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).

Arising from Section D :

* It would be helpful to scrutinise a range of Dissertations. I was only sent two scripts, both marginal/borderline, so I am not in a position to comment on mid- to higher range work. This could be done the day prior to the assessment board to save postage.

+ It would still be useful to be able to have a meeting with module leaders at some point on the day prior to the assessment board factored into the schedule. Also, conformity of documentation (eg provision of marks spreadsheets showing key statistical indicators for each module) across modules.

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):

Program	Module Code	Module Title	Level	Module Delivery
BA/BA (Hons) Marketing Management - UK	MKT09101	International Marketing	UG	UK
	MKT09102	Marketing Work Experience	UG	UK
	MKT10101	Emerging Markets	UG	UK
	MKT10133	Dissertation	UG	UK
BA/BA (Hons) Marketing Management HK	MKT09901	International Marketing	UG	Hong Kong
	MKT10901	Emerging Markets	UG	Hong Kong
	MKT10932	Dissertation	UG	Hong Kong
BA Hospitality and Marketing Management PSB, Singapore	MKT09701	International Marketing	UG	PSB Singapore

Section B:

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

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

conducted in accordance with University guidance?		
Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?	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>Overall, the standards of student work in the last year were largely consistent with those in several other universities in the UK that I'm familiar with. There were certain variances in levels within and across modules, which seemed to be reflective of students' divergent learning experiences that would be expected in most 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. This was reflected in programme module documentations, teaching materials and assessment procedures and practices.</p>
<p>3) Student Performance Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content</p>
<p>The students' work in these modules generally demonstrated strengths in the expected learning outcomes, e.g., depth of the subject knowledge and skills in analysis and relating to real-life practices.</p> <p>Some students revealed weaknesses in analysis and clarity in descriptions and articulations in their coursework and examination answers. This seemed to be more noticeable in some students in Hong Kong modules.</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 learning and teaching methods employed on these modules appeared effective. The teaching methods were consistent with those employed in other higher education institutions in the UK, reflecting efforts in implementing practices to the standards of Quality Code for Higher Education and SCQF.</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>The assessment and feedback process demonstrated fairness and rigour as expected in the programme and quality standards. The university's procedure was maintained and followed</p>

throughout the assessment process including those cases with fails or discrepancies in examiners' initial marks.

6) Good practice

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

Good practices (e.g., emphasises on learning outcomes suitable for transferable skills and demand of the societies, pedagogically detailed case study and coursework instructions, marking/grading templates with categorised feedback comments, etc.) were employed, reflecting efforts in implementing practices to the standards of Quality Code for Higher Education and SCQF.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

Some good practices were employed in different ways. There may be some methods/approaches that could help for dealing with common learning difficulties across modules. Departmental efforts could be made to involve members of staff to share their best-practice experiences and reflect on how such effective practices could be adopted or tailored for different modules. Some teaching materials given prior to students' start of the work (e.g., coursework/case-study pedagogically detailed instructions, etc.) appeared to be effective in clarifying students understanding of expectations of standards and organisation of the work. Among other good practices, such an effective practice could be shared by all the modules especially those modules on which a comparatively larger proportion of students showed poor performance.

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

x		
---	--	--

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		

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).

This is my first year of this job. The academic team and colleagues in the administration office were very helpful in providing necessary information and facilitating my job. The communication with the administration office on regular examination work was effective and constructive.



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

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

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT 2011/12

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

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

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

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

Section A Personal Details

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

Modules: MKT09103 – Marketing and Society; MKT09108 – Social Marketing; MKT10102 – Marketing Ethics; MKT11102 – Consumer Behaviour; MKT11108 - Principles and Practice of marketing; MKT11902 – Consumer Behaviour (HK); MKT11908 - Principles and Practices of Marketing (HK); MKT10130 UG Dissertation, shared; MKT10930 – UG dissertation (HK), shared

Insert the programme title to which this report refers:

Programmes: 34010BH, 34102BH, 34103BH, 34104BH, 34105BH, 34106BH, 37101BH, 37102BH - BA Marketing Management, BA Marketing Management with Entrepreneurship; 'with a Language: ' with digital media; 'with consumer behaviour; BA Marketing Studies; Flexible Managed Full Time Programme UG (NUBS); Flexible Part Time Programme (UG (NUBS)

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	

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

Section C

1) Comparability

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

The general standard of all the undergraduate work that I have seen is comparable to the level across other institutions that I am aware of and seems internally consistent across and within modules overall.

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?

The academic standards seem rigorous across all units that I have so far seen work from and are appropriately maintained across the modules and programmes of study, as would seem evident from the boards that I have attended.

3) Student Performance

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

The students still seem to perform well, with sufficient awareness of theory, although not always citing and referencing theory or applying it enough. This is probably not any more of an issue than in any other establishment although there remains a worry that the grading of work rather than giving an actual mark could lead to some mark drift upwards if not watched in the future.

<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>All seem good with a well-mixed set of assessments on most units showing a flexibility of students to be able to respond to dramatically varied forms of requested outputs, relevant to the business spheres in which they will be working in the future.</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>All modules and programmes appear to be fairly and rigorously assessed – and also duly considered in exam boards, with much discussion on performance and standards of individuals and cohorts. There remain some issues upon a lack of clarity in some of the structures of the marking processes in exams, however – particularly in marks allotted for theory repetition as opposed to simple text repeat or company/case description.</p>
<p>6) Good practice Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight</p>
<p>There is a good mix of assessment methods – including presentations, essays and examinations and the tutors are very aware of their topics and seem to set appropriate challenges to gain a mix of suitable skills for the programmes and modules.</p> <p>Most formative scripts appear to contain excellent feedback for the students and the teams seem interested in each students progress and abilities – trying to get them to the high standards obviously expected of them.</p>
<p>7) Recommendations Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.</p>
<p>It would be useful for the marker/moderator (as well as for guidance for students) if exam questions with more than one element to them were split into parts (a & b for instance), with parts of the full question's mark attributed to each. This still does not normally seem to be the practise in the majority scripts that I have seen despite myself raising this issue on a number of occasions.</p> <p>Marking guidance notes for exams should have parts of marks allotted within a coherent marking system – this, again, would seem still not to be the norm with most examination marking 'schemes' only listing a number of aspects that could or should appear in an answer and no mark divisions for each element – i.e. relevant marks for theory and/or application.</p> <p>This recommendation is carried over from the previous years when it was also noted as a concern.</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

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Draft Examination Papers

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

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Marking Examination Scripts

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

	No	
Yes		
Yes		

Dissertations/Project reports

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

Yes		
-----	--	--

Coursework/Continuously Assessed Work

- a. Was sufficient coursework made available to you for assessment?
- b. Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?

yes		
yes		

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

Yes		
		NA
Yes		
Yes		

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

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

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT 2013/14

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

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

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

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

This report is for: **modules:**

MKT11702 Consumer Behaviour

MKT11108 Principles and Practice of Marketing

MKT11408 Principles and Practice of Marketing (Global)

MKT11102 Consumer Behaviour

MKT11902 Consumer Behaviour (Hong Kong)

MKT11908 Principles and Practice of Marketing (Hong Kong)

MKT11130 PG Dissertation (shared)

MKT11930 PG Dissertation HK (shared)

Insert the programme title to which this report refers:

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	

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

Section C

1) Comparability

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

The general standard of all the Masters work that I have seen is comparable to the level of international Masters students studying in English across other institutions that I am aware of and seems internally consistent across and within modules overall.

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?

The academic standards seem reasonably rigorous across all units although there have been problems with referencing and, at times, insufficiently rigorous assessment and feedback upon this issue. Although this is a common problem within other Masters programmes featuring international students in an English-speaking curriculum, this is an issue that needs close monitoring in future years, particularly regarding the dissertation unit.

3) Student Performance

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

The students still seem to perform well, although theory awareness and citation remains a weak point, with theory application also being rather weak. This is probably not any more of an issue than in any other establishment although there remains a worry that the grading of work being limited at times with seeming difficulty in the cohorts stretching marks at the higher end. Greater attention to theoretical and conceptual issues could possibly remedy this in the future.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

All seem good, if (as said above) perhaps a little limited in theoretical scope, with a well-mixed set of assessments relevant to the business spheres in which they will be working in the future.

5) Assessment

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

All modules and programmes appear to be fairly and rigorously assessed – there remains a tendency to allot marks for simple text repeat or company/case description in some cases, but the limited range of grading awarded across the cohort probably reflects this tendency in the student work.

6) Good practice

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

There is a good mix of assessment methods that set appropriate challenges to gain a mix of suitable skills for the programmes and modules.

Most formative scripts appear to contain reasonable to good feedback for the students and the teaching team would seem interested in the students' progress and abilities.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

Marking guidance notes for exams should have parts of marks allotted within a coherent marking system – i.e. relevant marks for theory and/or application or parts of questions.

This recommendation continues to be carried over from the previous years.

More attention should be made to theoretical breadth and depth in the literature (rather than simply textbook material) in order to improve referencing and stretch marks at the top end.

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

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

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?

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Marking Examination Scripts

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

	No	
Yes		
Yes		

Dissertations/Project reports

- Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

Yes		
-----	--	--

Coursework/Continuously Assessed Work

- Was sufficient coursework made available to you for assessment?
- Was the method and general standard of marking and

yes		
yes		

consistency satisfactory?

--	--	--

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?

	No	
		NA
Yes		
Yes		

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):

LNG09127 English for Professional Purposes 5

LNG09128 English for Professional Purposes 6

LNG10126 English for Professional Purposes 7a

LNG10127 English for Professional Purposes 7b

LNG10124 English for Professional Purposes 8a

LNG10125 English for Professional Purposes 8b

(7a and 7 b run in alternate years; 8a and 8b run in alternate years)

LNG11107 Introduction to Teaching EFL

LNG11108 Teaching EFL

LNG10133 Dissertation (ug)

LNG11130 Dissertation (MSc)

LNG11115 Postgraduate Language (English)

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 of student work was comparable with that of students taking equivalent modules at other 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>Overall I felt that the academic level was appropriate, and would only raise two points:</p> <p>I had a few concerns about the currency of the theory and research literature being used in the "Teaching EFL' modules.</p> <p>I felt that overall greater use should have been made of academic and business source material in the "English for Professional Purposes' modules.</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>Overall I felt that the student performance was satisfactory across all modules, and demonstrated that the learning outcomes were being attained. Some very strong pieces of work.</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>From the materials I reviewed, it appears that these modules are conducted in a creative and interactive manner which is likely to be highly engaging and also very appropriate to the learning outcomes.</p>

5) Assessment

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

I felt that the assessments were rigorously conducted and that the marks were fairly allocated, although I felt that overall they perhaps erred on the generous side. I also felt that some of the tasks required rather a short essay length for the level.

I was confused as to why a language cloze test was included in LNG10125 as there did not seem to be a corresponding focus in the learning outcomes for this module.

6) Good practice

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

Helpful constructive feedback and some well-designed and helpfully scaffolded assessment tasks.

I was impressed by the materials and assessment design of LNG09128, particularly the peer assessment and self-reflective elements.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

LNG11108 Teaching EFL: I would appreciate seeing the student lesson plans for this module in future. I would also recommend that the literature used in this and also in LNG1107 Introduction to Teaching EFL be refreshed and updated. I was somewhat unclear as to the justification for having these two distinct modules and how they differed in terms of learning outcomes - also I was not sure whether the first is a prerequisite of the other. It would be good to have that issue clarified.

In LNG09127 English for Professional Purposes I felt that the reports produced were slightly unclear in terms of genre and audience, and would recommend that the module leader consider this issue and provide more clarity on the format of business reports – e.g. I would expect to see an executive summary and recommendations.

In LNG10127 English for Professional Purposes I was unable to comment on the presentations – it would be helpful to receive an audio recording of these plus any PowerPoint slides (as I did for presentations in other modules). In this module I would also recommend that the students be required to read at least one text with an academic register as source material for their essay, rather than only web-based resources. I would also suggest that the topics for exam questions should be reviewed and made more appropriate

for the stated focus on 'professional purposes'.

In LNG10125 English for Professional Purposes I would suggest that the module leader bring the assessment and learning outcomes into closer alignment in terms of the inclusion of the cloze test.

I did not receive handbooks, module descriptors, assessment criteria and rubrics etc for all of the modules– it would be helpful if I could be supplied the same level of detail in terms of documentation in future.

It would be helpful if module leaders and tutors could provide typed feedback to students as handwritten notes can be difficult to read and could make it less likely that students will attend to the feedback.

I would also recommend that the feedback be more consistently aligned closely against the assessment criteria, as in some cases I felt that it was not sufficiently focused on the stated learning outcomes.

I would suggest that the modules leaders reflect on the required length of the essays which I did feel were rather short for the level and may in fact be too short to provide students with the opportunity to demonstrate the learning outcomes. It may be worth requiring student to produce longer texts.

I would recommend that all results be presented anonymously with student numbers only provided.

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	

NB: received more documentation for some modules than others.

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? – not received
- 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

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

LNG09101 (French5); LNG 09107 (French 6a); LNG09124 (French 6b); LNG10106 (French 7b);
LNG10111 (French 8a); LNG10106 (Advanced French Negotiation) ;LNG09120 (Topical Study)
Honours dissertation

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

BA Languages Suite of Programmes (French modules)

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.

As in other higher education institutions, including my own, with which I am familiar, there is a wide range of achievement between the best and weakest students on any one module, but all the students who pass the modules are attaining the required benchmark standards in terms of language, content and structure.

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 each module is clearly defined and the level of language attainment expected is related to the Common European Framework. These standards are carefully maintained and explicitly referred to in the notes made by markers on written work and in the evaluation of oral examinations.

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 have produced some outstanding work, both written and oral. Particular mention should be made of an Honours dissertation which dealt with the forthcoming referendum on Scottish independence from an unusual angle. It was a well-documented, perceptive and lucidly argued piece of work. Equally impressive in their different ways were the three Advanced Negotiation interviews which I saw. The students were able to operate effectively and imaginatively in a simulated professional context. The weakest work, some essays produced by students in French 6, was mitigated by passable performances from the same candidates in the oral.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

The students at all levels have been challenged to study a diverse range of topical material in French and to present and discuss their ideas clearly. An appropriate range of tasks, written and oral, have enabled them to develop their linguistic skills to the required level. In addition to linguistic skills in French, they have achieved valuable transferable skills.

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 and feedback process is exemplary in its fairness and the rigour of its documentation.

6) Good practice

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

The written feedback given to each student on their oral examination is a practice which other institutions of higher education would do well to adopt.

The design, delivery and evaluation of LNG10106 (French 8b: Advanced Negotiation) is an outstanding example of good practice. It is challenging, both for the examiner as well as for the students, but the results show that the best students rise to the challenge in terms of linguistic, practical and inter-personal skills.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

The module leader in French has been fortunate to be able to call upon a very able native-speaker *lecteur* who has contributed to the teaching and assessment in ways that go beyond what would normally be expected of someone in his temporary position. It strikes me that the long-term sustainability of the French modules would be enhanced if the module leader could count on more permanent support in the future. She is currently responsible for the design, delivery and assessment of all the French modules and although colleagues in other languages are also competent in French and do help, this arrangement does not appear to be very sustainable. It is remarkable that the module leader has had the energy and enthusiasm to design and develop innovative modules such as LNG10106 French 8B: Advanced French Negotiation despite her heavy workload.

Section D:

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

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

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

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

	NO	
	NO	
YES		
YES		

Draft Examination Papers

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

	NO	
		NA
		NA

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

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

YES		
YES		
YES		

Dissertations/Project reports

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

YES		
-----	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?

	NO	
--	----	--

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

Yes by email		
		NA
YES		
YES		

Any other comments?

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

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

I have now completed three years as an external examiner at Napier, but I am willing to serve for a fourth year if I am still eligible to do so after I have retired from my post in Aberdeen with effect from 31 July 2014.

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	6 and 8b

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):

Spanish

6 LNG09109

8b LNG10118

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>	<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.

The standard of the sampled work is of an expected and appropriate quality for students undertaking this level of language study. The level of expectation and the results match well with submissions I have seen in my own and at least three other institutions in the UK.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

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

The academic standards appear to be most rigorously adhered to. The work appears certainly safely within the parameters of the benchmark statements and the SCQF levels.

3) Student Performance

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

There are no surprises here, as would be expected of sampled submissions at this level. The module content and clear learning objectives are met by most and where any should fall short or a little behind there is clearly much feedback and useful guidance. The variety of exercises clearly challenges candidates, and there are no trick areas, but opportunities within the key writing, presentation, comprehension and oral skills exercises for them to show real progress and attainment.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

This is always difficult to assess without in-class peer review, but if this extensive and precise written feedback is anything to go by then it can be considered that the teaching methods are very thorough, encouraging and still rigorous

5) Assessment

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

As above: the level and precision of the feedback is admirable. The assessment criteria and intended learning outcomes are patent throughout. The level of detail in terms of feedback on grammar, lexis, structures etc. is also very clear and useful.

6) Good practice

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

As noted above, and also that there is a nice, genuine hands-on sense about this marking – that the assessment criteria are ticked and crossed, but also that the students have very precise and clear information about their performance. Of course, this is more feasible at these levels where the language is still less abstract and clear, basic language mistakes are made, however there is also evidence of much encouragement to express more fully as well as accurately.

<p>7) Recommendations</p> <p>Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.</p>
<p>Commendations, rather than recommendations. All samples were fully and fairly marked. The detailed marking criteria are very useful guide for the students. The samples show consistency across the various assessments and that several sets of eyes have considered these submissions. This is all good work and the only current recommendation is that the teaching staff involved are commended for what can be a very arduous business. .</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

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

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

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?

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

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?

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?

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

To date I have not had the opportunity to visit and attend a Board of Examiners, which I consider remiss given I have attended every other as External Examiner at other institutions. In this case, it has been entirely down to timing and commitments for me, and not the arrangements made in Edinburgh.

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):

Dissertation

LNG09102 German 5

LNG 09108 German 6

German 6a

LNG09125 German 6b

German 7a

LNG 10107 German 7b

German 8a

LNG10117 German 8b

LNG 10123 Communication in International Management

LNG09112 Topical Study

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

Languages Joint Honours, School of Marketing, Tourism & Languages

Section B:

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

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

Section C:

<p>1) Comparability Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.</p>
<p>Standards of assessment tasks, curriculum and student work are set at an appropriate level across modules within the course. Standards of student work are quite high and compare favourably with those found within the higher education institutions I am familiar with.</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, all modules are set at the appropriate level and meet the threshold academic standards. The standard of each module is clearly defined in the programme handbook/ module descriptor. For the language modules, the level of language acquisition that is expected is related to the Common European Framework.</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>Generally, students appear to engage very well with the programme/ modules. They are given the opportunity to learn critically and develop their research skills at the same time as they study a language at the appropriate level. On the LNG 10123 module, I came across some very good evidence of students' ability to think critically. On the language modules some excellent work was produced, both orally and in writing - I was impressed with the depth of analysis and the originality of ideas in some cases. Some excellent linguistic skills were shown on the interpreting module: students whose mother tongue is not English effortlessly interpreted from foreign language into foreign language.</p>
<p>4) Learning and Teaching Please comment on the effectiveness of the Learning and Teaching methods employed on the modules and/or programmes</p>
<p>Learning, teaching and assessment is very effective indeed. Syllabi and assessment tasks are carefully designed, demanding and effective. Topics are interesting, varied and intellectually challenging. On the language modules, summative and formative assessment methods are carefully blended and the individual assessments progressively build on one another. Sometimes students are required to submit plans on their work. Assessments are well spread throughout the term and students are given detailed feedback in good time before the next assessment –thus they are very well supported in their learning.</p>
<p>5) Assessment</p>

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

Marking is fair, transparent and consistent. The high standard is achieved through very appropriate and well-applied marking criteria and a rigorous second-marking policy. Exams are conducted in a fair and sensitive manner.

Because of the variety of skills that are being taught and tested and the comprehensiveness of the assessment, grades are a very accurate reflection of students' abilities.

6) Good practice

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

The high quality of the course information given to students: course descriptions and module planners are very detailed, clear and consistently provided. This is very good practise.

The careful blend of formative and summative assessment supports students' learning in the best possible way and takes the anxiety out of the assessment. This is to be highly commended.

The thoroughness and timing of the feedback for students is an outstanding example of good practice.

Marking criteria for the language modules are specially designed not only for each skill but also adapted for each task which is very good practise.

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

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Draft Examination Papers

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

		n/a
Yes		
n/a		

Marking Coursework/ Examination Scripts

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

Yes		
Yes		
Yes		

Dissertations/Project reports

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

Yes		
-----	--	--

Board of Examiners meeting

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

Yes		
		n/a
Yes		
Yes		
		n/a

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 would like to thank the faculty and administrative teams for their hard work, efficiency and guidance.

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

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

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT 2013/14

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

Your report will be given primary consideration at subject level and will inform annual monitoring. The University Quality 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

- 05 July 2014 for duties relating to undergraduate provision
- 26 October 2014 for duties relating to taught masters provision

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

Duties

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

Insert module titles and numbers to which this report refers:

LNG 11106 Intercultural Business Communication

LNG 1110 Managing Cross-Cultural Diversity In Organisations

LNG 1130 Dissertation

Insert the programme title to which this report refers:

31420 MM MSc Intercultural Business Communication

31421 MM MSc Intercultural Business Communication with TESOL

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	

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

Section C

1) Comparability Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.
Standards of student work on modules within the course are comparable with those in other higher education institutions 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?
The academic standard of the modules I examined were set and maintained at M-level.

3) Student Performance

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

Most students achieved distinction level work this year, which reflected a high level of performance as well a staff input.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

The Learning and Teaching Methods were effective and appropriate for the level and focus of the modules I examined. In particular, the inclusion of reflective logs was in keeping with the current trends in HE.

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 and feedback process employed on the modules I examined were fair and rigorous. I read the sample of assessed work in descending order of merit, and the grading was carried out to a high degree of precision. The system of second marking appeared rigorous – where grades were disputed they were resolved through consensus of the two markers. The feedback on the assignment was thoroughgoing and apposite.

6) Good practice

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

- Lecturers gave very pertinent and thoughtful comments as feedback on students' assignments and dissertations.
- Module information sheets and course descriptions were exemplary – impeccably laid out with lots of detail
- Teaching on research methods to enhance the final dissertations
- Range of genres explored in assessment was relevant to skills relevant to future professional engagement and employability

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

In discussion with the subject leader, and with a view to boosting recruitment rather than remedying any pedagogical deficit on the program, I would recommend that the course team consider implementing some form of work placement as part of the programme at some point in the future.

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

YES		
YES		
YES		
YES		

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?

YES		
YES		
YES		

Marking Examination Scripts

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

YES		
YES		
YES		

Dissertations/Project reports

- Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

YES		
-----	--	--

Coursework/Continuously Assessed Work

- a. Was sufficient coursework made available to you for assessment?
- b. Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?

YES		
YES		

Board of Examiners meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting?
- b. If you were unable to attend the meeting were you offered the opportunity to provide views on student performance, progression and awards?
- c. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- d. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?

YES		
		NA
YES		
YES		

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

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

EDINBURGH NAPIER UNIVERSITY

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

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

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

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

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

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

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

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):

TSM11103 International Conference Management

TSM11903 International Conference Management (Hong Kong)

TSM11101 Business Skills for Event Management

TSM11108 Tourism Marketing

TSM11608 Tourism Marketing (Malta)

TSM11110 International Festival and Event Management

TSM11910 International Festival and Event Management (Hong Kong)

TSM11 102 Industry Project

TSM11105 Case Studies in International Tourism

TSM11605 Case Studies in International Tourism (Malta)

TSM11109 Tourism, Society and Visual Culture

TSM11109 Tourism, Society and Visual Culture (Malta)

TSM11111 Tourism Concepts and Issues

TSM11611 Tourism Concepts and Issues (Malta)

TSM11104 Managing Heritage Tourism

TSM11064 Managing Heritage Tourism (Malta)

TSM11704 Managing Heritage Tourism (Switzerland)

TSM11106 Contemporary Issues in Hospitality Management

TSM11607 Contemporary Issues in Hospitality Management (Malta)

TSM11701 Hospitality Management Practice Report (Switzerland)

TSM11130 Dissertation

TSM11930 Dissertation (Hong Kong)

TSM11630 Dissertation (Malta)

TSM11732 Dissertation (Switzerland)

TSM11632 Research Methods (Malta)

TSM11732 Research Methods (Switzerland)

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

MSc International Event and Festival Management - Full and Part Time

MSc International Tourism Management - Full and Part Time

MSc Tourism and Hospitality Management - Full and Part Time

MSc Heritage and Cultural Tourism Management - Full and 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:

<p>1) Comparability Please comment on the comparability of standards of student work between modules within a course (if appropriate) and those in other higher education institutions you may be familiar with.</p>
<p>I am familiar with student work at a number of other institutions along with my own and I believe that students are achieving standards that are comparable to that found at other HEIs. Additionally I feel that the standards of work that I have seen are comparable across modules within courses and between the different programmes of study that I am reviewing.</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 standards do appear to be set and maintained at an appropriate level for Masters study. I have examined these modules over 3 years and believe that the standards have been consistent over this period.</p>
<p>3) Student Performance Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content</p>
<p>I have oversight of 4 different programmes taught across four campuses and can report that the students are generally performing well across the provision. The work that they produce is, on the whole, strong and care is taken to provide interesting and relevant case studies and examples that reflect their wide international profile. I have commented in the past on common weaknesses and these remain – as they do at my own institution and others with which I'm familiar. These weaknesses include a reluctance to use academic sources, an overly descriptive approach and a failure to address all parts of an assessment brief. The teaching teams are very aware of these weaknesses and report on strategies to address them.</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 Learning and Teaching methods employed are effective and make good use of 'real-life' case study material, organisations and reports. Module documentation is clear and detailed and tutors use a good range of assessment types within and across modules to assess a wide range of skills and knowledge areas.</p>

<p>5) Assessment Please comment on the fairness and the rigour of the assessment and feedback process employed on the modules and/or programmes</p>
<p>I have marked a rather large selection of samples (more than 34 individual samples and 6 different sets of Masters dissertations this year) and I can confirm that the marking of the work has been consistent and appropriate. Good evidence of second marking can be found. The full range of grades is used and students are always told exactly why they were awarded their particular grade.</p>
<p>6) Good practice Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight</p>
<p>As I said last year, some tutors include assessed plans within their strategies and these seem to be an effective tool to help students improve their final submission – this is an example of very good practice which should be maintained.</p> <p>Some tutors give extremely good, detailed feedback – both individual and class-based commentary. This level of student support should be applauded.</p>
<p>7) Recommendations Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.</p>
<p>I made the recommendation last year that all tutors could perhaps provide a short overview/commentary on the running of the course and their insights on the overall performance. Some already do this but it would be useful if all tutors provided this information.</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?

I attended the Programme Board on 14/2/14		
√		
√		
I have not received any response to previous reports		

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	3
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):

Direct & Digital Marketing (UG) MKT09106
 Social Marketing MKT09108
 Brand Management (UG UK) MKT09909
 Brand Management (HK/Overseas) MKT09909
 Marketing Management in Practice MKT10103
 Marketing Management in Practice (HK/Overseas) MKT10103
 Direct & Digital Marketing (PG) MKT11105
 Direct & Digital Marketing (HK) MKT11105
 Strategic Brand Management (PG) MKT11103
 Strategic Brand Management (HK) MKT11103
 Dissertations (PG & UG) MKT11130 & MKT11930
 Retail Marketing MKT09107
 Direct & Digital Marketing MKT11905
 Strategic Brand Management (HK) MKT11903
 International Marketing MKT09901
 Brand Management MKT09109
 Marketing Management in Practice (HK) MKT10903

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

MSc Marketing Suite
 MSc International Marketing Suite
 BA Marketing Management (HK)

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>	3	
<p>Student Performance Are the standards of student performance properly judged against the level set?</p>	3	
<p>Assessment Is the assessment process appropriate, rigorous, equitable and conducted in accordance with University guidance?</p>	3	
<p>Comparable Standards Is the standard and level of student achievement comparable with those in other higher education institutions?</p>	3	

Section C:

1) Comparability

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

Standards of student work across all levels, modules and programmes are entirely comparable with standards of student work within other universities and UK HEIs.

2) Commentary on Academic issues

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

Yes, the academic standards are commensurate with the appropriate levels, are consistent throughout the modules and programmes, meet the threshold academic standards and map across to all applicable benchmark and level descriptors.

3) Student Performance

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

As students progress through their learning journeys, it is evident that their work becomes increasingly critical, analytical and informed by theory. Levels of student engagement are high, and the incidence of poor student performance is low.

As with other university cohorts, the performance of many non-EU students is slightly lower than that of home and EU-based students, and this appears to stem from extrinsic factors such as less familiarity with the language of study. However, the School mitigates such issues extremely effectively through support mechanisms, accessibility of assessments, and by recruiting progressively stronger cohorts.

4) Learning and Teaching

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

A range of learning and teaching methods are utilised within the school to ensure accessibility and variety within the learning experience. All different learning types are catered for, and the delivery is learner-oriented rather than didactic. Consideration of the student experience is evident within the modules and assessment tasks.

5) Assessment

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

All assessments are extremely valid, reliable, sufficient, fair and suitable for the learning being assessed. There is an excellent variety of tasks which suggests planning and co-ordination across the school has occurred, rather than each module existing in isolation. Assessment tasks embed academic, interpersonal and employability skills, helping to bridge the gap between academic theory and vocational knowledge. Students appear to relish the challenges laid down and respond accordingly, knowing that high achievement is recognised. Feedback is clear, constructive and thorough, 'feeding forward' to advise students how to improve their work and develop as learners.

6) Good practice

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

The School mixes individual and group assessed work very well, to help prepare students for the work environment, and has in place a method of peer evaluation to ensure that group assessed marks are allocated fairly and in accordance with individual students' contributions to group tasks.

It is clear from discussions in the Module Board of Examiners that the academic staff of the School are very knowledgeable about their students at an individual level, and use this knowledge to deliver differentiated learning rather than simply offering 'one-size-fits-all' education – the School and its staff should be highly commended for this, and it is undoubtedly of great value to their students.

7) Recommendations

Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.

All aspects of teaching and assessment within the School appear to be undertaken in a very professional and rigorous manner. I would encourage the School to continue finding additional ways to 'stretch' the most capable 10% or so of students within assessments from 75% work to 85% work and even beyond, by ensuring that marking criteria discriminate between 'excellent' and 'exceptional' 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

3		
3		
3		
3		

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?

3		
3		
3		

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?

3		
3		
3		

Dissertations/Project reports

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

3		
---	--	--

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

3		
3		

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?

3		
3		
3		

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):

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

Programme	Module No.	Module Title	UG/PG	Module Delivery
MSc Marketing - UK	MKT11101	Marketing Communications	PG	UK
	MKT11104	Global Marketing	PG	UK
	MKT11130	Dissertation	PG	UK
MSc Marketing/with Festival and Event Management HK	MKT11901	Marketing Communications	PG	Hong Kong
	MKT11904	Global Marketing	PG	Hong Kong
	MKT11930	Dissertation	PG	Hong Kong
MSc Business Management, PSB, Singapore	MKT11704	Global Marketing	PG	PSB Singapore
MSc Business Management (Marketing), PSB Singapore	MKT11701	Marketing Communications	PG	PSB Singapore
	MKT11705	Global Marketing	PG	PSB Singapore

Section B:

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

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

Section C:

<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 the last year were consistent with other universities in the UK that I'm familiar with. There were certain variances in levels within and across modules, which seemed to be reflective of students' divergent learning experiences that would be expected in most 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. Good academic standards and practices are evident in programme module documentations, teaching materials and assessment instructions and criteria.</p>
<p>3) Student Performance Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the student performance with respect to module and/or programme content</p>
<p>The students' work in these programs and modules generally demonstrated strengths in the expected learning outcomes, e.g., depth of the subject knowledge and skills in analysis and relating to real-life practices.</p> <p>It is noticeable that the proportion of weak performances in Hong Kong and Singapore programmes is larger than those in the UK.</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 learning and teaching methods employed on these modules/programmes appeared effective. However, the relatively large proportion of weak performance in students' assessments in Hong Kong and Singapore is worth attention.</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>The assessment and feedback process demonstrated fairness and rigour as expected for the programmes and modules. The university's procedure was maintained and followed throughout the assessment process.</p>
<p>6) Good practice Please comment on any areas of good practice that you wish to highlight</p>
<p>The PG modules employed some good practices, e.g., emphasises on learning outcomes suitable for transferable skills and demand of the societies, pedagogically detailed case studies, detailed coursework instructions including guidance on how the work should be carried out and composed to a high standard. These reflect academic member staff's efforts in implementing practices to the standards of Quality Code for Higher Education and SCQF.</p>
<p>7) Recommendations Please specify any recommendations that you wish to make.</p>
<p>Good practices could be communicated and shared among members of staff involved in these programmes/modules.</p> <p>Staff involved in Hong Kong and Singapore programmes/modules including local tutors may need to review the poor performance cases and find some pragmatic and effective approaches to increase the proportion of good performance in assessments.</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

x		
x		
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)
- 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).

All my communication is with the administration office, and the communication is efficient and effective. In the future, I would expect and appreciate direct



responses from academic staff involved in specific modules when such communication is needed.

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