
External Examiners' report template (Programme Assessment Board)

Purpose of the External Examiner's report

Please read this section before writing your report

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

Reports should be submitted within **four weeks** following the final Programme Assessment Board. Report submission should not be delayed until re-sit boards have taken place.

The report should be linked with programme aims and outcomes, and the assessment criteria for each module, as described in the programme/module handbook(s). Reports should be objective and make positive criticism and/or recommendations where appropriate.

External Examiners' reports are the property of the University. The University will circulate reports as it sees fit, in accordance with legislative requirements. External Examiner reports are public documents, and are seen by students at Programme Voice Group meetings. **Please do not reference individual students and members of staff by name.**

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

Full details of the procedures, and the use of the reports is outlined in [LQEH section 4](#).

Submission of the report

Please submit your report via email to the following email address:

externalexaminer@mdx.ac.uk

Your annual fee will be processed once we receive a copy of your annual report.

External Examiner Report – Programme Assessment Board

External Examiner name	Peter Clough
Academic Year (period covered by report)	2024/25
Date report submitted to Externalexaminer@mdx.ac.uk	03.06.25

Programme(s) reviewed	CPT3A		
Apprenticeship standard (if applicable)			
Module(s) moderated	Certificate in Psychometric Testing (CCET) Access Arrangements (AAC)		
Name of Programme Leader/ Module Leader	Mark Turner		
Date(s) Programme assessment board(s) attended	N/A		
Programmes/module delivery arrangements – tick all that are applicable	Apprenticeship		
	Hendon Campus		
	Dubai Campus		
	Malta Campus		
	Mauritius campus		
	Collaborative partner:	Yes/ No	Partner(s) name
	Franchise		
	Joint		
	Validated	✓	Real Training

To be completed by all external examiners by ticking the appropriate box:

OVERALL STANDARDS	Yes	No
1. In your view, are the standards set for the award(s) appropriate for the qualification(s)? <i>For apprenticeship programmes, consider whether they reflect the apprenticeship standard.</i>	✓	
2. In your view, are the standards of student performance equivalent to other UK institutions with which you are familiar?	✓	
N/A		

Support for the role of External Examiner	Yes	No
(For new external Examiners) Did you find the induction arrangements effective in helping you understand your role and the University's expectations of you?		
I confirm that the ACEE measures/evidence which form the body of evidence were sufficient for me to provide an overall judgement on student performance and the quality and standard of the programme	✓	
The Faculty and Programme Team communicated effectively with me throughout the year	✓	
I was given sufficient information concerning my role as an External Examiner	✓	
I was given sufficient information concerning the modules for which I am appointed to enable full consideration of delivery, including collaborative partner provision, franchises and overseas campuses, if applicable	✓	
Did you receive formal written feedback on your report for the previous academic year? (N/A for EEs completing their first report)	✓	
Were you satisfied with the response to the issues raised in your report for the previous academic year?	✓	
Comments (if 'no' to any of the above): <i>I was grateful for the email feedback about my last report. It is clear that my observations have been appreciated and taken seriously, as evidenced by an account of internal moderation being included with the sample.</i>		

Report

Please use the following headings and guidance notes:

Programme/ Subject design, content and standards

Please comment on;

- the extent to which standards (apprenticeship standards; PSRB requirements; Professional benchmark statements) are appropriate to the qualification, or qualification element under consideration on comparable UK Higher Education programmes
- the curriculum, its aims, content, and development
- Does the course content remain relevant and up to date?
- please comment only on those modules that have strengths, weaknesses or areas of good practice that you would wish to highlight
- Where the programme has a vocational element or link, please comment on the content of the course in terms of preparing students for employment in that sector

The course evidently provides a firm grounding in psychometrics, test choice and administration, and feedback skills.

Psychometric and other assessment tests are current, and students are required to critically engage with assessment materials by producing a review of at least one test kit.

Students who are successful have been effectively prepared to administer and interpret a range of assessments and make evidence-based judgements about learners' strengths and weaknesses.

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

Yes

No

Are you satisfied that the level of student achievement is comparable across all locations of programme delivery (e.g. overseas campuses, franchise programmes)

✓

Please comment on:

- standards achieved by students
- student performance in relation to their peers on comparable courses
- student performance in modules taught at overseas campuses (Dubai, Mauritius) and modules on franchised and joint validated programmes at UK and overseas sites
- student performance in relation to clinical/professional practice (if applicable)
- student performance in relation to PSRB requirements (if applicable)
- the effectiveness of employer engagement (if applicable)
- foundation degrees: Are there sufficient and effective opportunities for work-based learning and work-related learning?
- strengths and weaknesses of the cohort
- factors that the External Examiner is aware of that have positively or negatively affected student performance (e.g. resources, field trips etc.)

I enjoyed reviewing the work sample provided. As there were submissions from students who had accessed 'old' and 'revised' versions of the course I was able to see how the course is being actively developed and refined.

On this occasion the bulk of the sample was of high quality, with only a few weaker pieces of work overall. I did note that candidates responses to one of the tasks - to critique a report produced by computer - were remarkably similar to each other, suggesting that that particular task is rather narrow (or that the teaching in that area is especially strong!)

As on a previous occasion I did note that some pieces of work had not been effectively proofread and edited. Typing errors are to be expected - I'm sure that I make them myself - and I am aware that lengthy focus on a piece of writing can render the writer a little word-blind. I was nevertheless concerned by some errors, such as giving 'special' for 'spatial' in the context of formal reports. I also found significant variability in the presentation of candidates' writing. Some pieces were presented very clearly and were easy to read and follow, while others were overly busy and quite tiring to look at. Established standards for fonts, font-sizes, borders and line-spacing could help to address this issue. Given that candidates are learning to write reports about and for individuals who may have some difficulties with reading it is recommended that they reflect on the layout and readability of their own writing.

Assessments: structure, design and marking	Yes	No
I was given the opportunity to see samples of marked work (including written assignments and examination scripts) covering the full range of marks	✓	✓
I saw evidence of internal moderation in the assessment process and confirm it was used effectively and consistently	✓	
See evidence of adequate student feedback being provided to students	✓	
I saw samples of work from across all programme sites of delivery including overseas campuses and franchises where applicable	?	

Please comment on:

- *appropriateness of assessment for measuring achievement of standards*
- *The appropriateness and rigour of the course assessment strategy and methods of assessment;*
- *standards of marking and moderation (please comment on all overseas campuses and sites)*
- *procedures for assessment and examination.*
- *effectiveness and quality of feedback to students*
- *Are the processes for assessment, examination sound and fairly conducted in line with the University's/ Collaborative partner's (where applicable) regulations?*

The portfolio approach provides students with the opportunity to engage with relevant topics and skills in a flexible way, allowing them to explore areas of interest while still providing clear evidence of required standards/achievement; it is appropriate to the topic and skills being taught.

Written feedback from tutors to students was quite limited in some cases on this occasion. Feedback templates are provided for tutors but I understand that some tutors continue to provide feedback via direct messages. While this may be an efficient way for tutors to communicate with students it does make it rather difficult to audit or review the quality of their feedback. Where feedback templates were used tutors' comments were generally helpful, though some were simply positive and encouraging. I did also see some examples of messages between a candidate and a tutor - these were quite conversational, and I felt that there was a potential risk of tutors simply coaching candidates regarding what to write in some of their assessed pieces (NB - I am not suggesting that this was happening in the example I saw, I am raising it as a more general risk).

On this occasion I have also had the opportunity to look at an internal moderation process summary. Doing so was very useful, particularly with regard to a candidate whose work I was able to access. It is clear that tutors and moderators are rigorous in their approach to marking and that they are confident to challenge and defend judgements.

Programme Assessment Boards	Yes	No
Did you attend the Programme Assessment Board (this could include attendance via Microsoft Teams)?		✓
Did you receive relevant meeting, board, deadline dates and board paperwork in a timely manner?	✓	
<i>Please comment on:</i> <i>The organisation and conduct of Programme Assessment Boards and, in the event of non-attendance, whether you were fully involved in the assessment process..</i>		
<i>I regret that I have been unable to attend an assessment board this year.</i>		
School /Work Placement visits (if applicable) <i>If you attended any school/ work placement visits please provide comments below:</i> <i>Was the School/ work placement appropriate to support the students and delivery of the programme learning outcomes?</i> <i>Was there evidence of good collaboration between Middlesex University and the School / work placement?</i> <i>Was the assessment of trainees' attainment comparable with similar judgements across the sector?</i>		
N/A		

Apprenticeship programmes (if applicable)

Please consider and comment on:

- Do the programme and module learning outcomes mirror the knowledge, skills and behaviours (KSBs) set out in the apprenticeship standard and prepare apprentices for end-point assessment (EPA)?
- Is teaching and learning delivered in the context of on-the-job and off-the-job training?
- Are apprentices receiving a good level of support from the University?
- Does the partner work collaboratively with the apprentices' employers?
- Does the apprenticeship include an integrated or non-integrated degree?

N/A

Collaborative Programmes

Please add any comments relating to the links between the University and the collaborative institution.

N/A

Recommendations

Please use this section to provide the programme team with suggestions that you would like them to consider, arising from the comments within your report matters where, in your opinion, there is potential for enhancement.

In future samples I would hope to see a closer focus on clear layout and presentation, especially in assessment reports. I would also hope to see more examples of tutors' formative and summative feedback, preferably using formal feedback templates.

Actions

Please use this section if you require the programme team to take further action relating to issues which have a serious impact on academic standards or academic quality.

N/A

Commendations / Good practice

Please comment here on any particular strengths, distinctive or innovative features of the programme(s)/ modules

The portfolio approach is a flexible and interesting way to develop skills and knowledge in the area of psychometrics and test administration.

Final Report – only applicable if you are completing your term as an External Examiner

Please consider and comment on:

- Your overall experience of being an external examiner
- The overall development of the Programme/Modules during this time.

N/A