

LTC17D107

Title: Faculty Reports on External Examiner Reports
Matters for University level consideration & good practice
Author: Michele Pavey
Circulation: LTC – 14 March 2018
Agenda: LTC17A004
Version: Final
Status: Open

Issue

Recommendation

Recipients are invited to note the good practice and issues identified for university level consideration arising from the 2015/16 FMH Taught Postgraduate report and the 2016/17 SCI UG and PGT report

Resource Implications

N/A

Risk Implications

N/A

Equality and Diversity

N/A

Timing of decisions

N/A

Further Information

Michele Pavey (M.Pavey@uea.ac.uk)

School	Issue Identified	Proposed action
FMH	<p>Our External Examiners continue to provide very positive commentary where electronic marking and full use of Blackboard have been adopted – this adds additional support to the ambition to implement fully our provision.</p>	<p>Continue the good practice</p>
SCI Schools	<p>Absence of routine use of plagiarism software - Regularly raised by External Examiners (BIO, ENV and PHA). Noted that some HEI's have detection software built in to submission software (as opposed to use by students prior to submission) and this is preferred by Externals (and Committee members) to highlight those students who are not completing their own work. - ENV have recently piloted the routine use of Turnitin but unsure how this fits into the wider UEA plans.</p> <p>Award regulations (BIO, CMP). - Noted that uplift algorithm is generous as rounding takes place at module and stage levels which means that an aggregate award mark of 67.5 equates to a First. Current practice puts the majority of borderline students into a higher degree classification and - should be done according to computer rounding rather than on academic principle? Lack of discretion in relation to borderline cases - The demise of starred firsts, as a way to recognise outstanding students, is a shame - New compensation rules might be interpreted differently by different exam boards</p> <p>Provision of Information - Problems accessing information on Blackboard (CHE) - Externals should be able to look at what they want and not some selected material anyway (CHE) i.e. 10% sample across the range of classifications - Amount of information on blackboard was not sufficient (CHE) - Marking schemes/ descriptors must be available (CHE); Bespoke marking criteria for items of assessment, not just the Senate scale (ENV) - Instructions to students for CW weren't on Blackboard this year (ENV) - A continuing theme is the lack of statistical analysis of MCQ assessments (PHA)</p>	<p>Refer to LTC Plagiarism and Collusion Review Group</p> <p>Refer to the Academic Director of Taught Programmes (ADTP) and the Head of LTS (Systems)</p> <p>Refer to ADTP for further discussion on marking criteria and sampling.</p> <p>Blackboard issues identified should be dealt with by the School</p>

	<p>Limited progress - Requests from previous years have not acted upon- it needs to be made clear which requests can be dealt with by the school directly (and should therefore be acted upon) and which involve a change in university procedure/rules/IT services and might therefore be outside of the scope of the school to change. If the recommendations by external examiners are not acted upon, this can lead to an erosion of reputation quite quickly (CHE, ENV)</p>	<p>LTC Secretary to respond to CHE and ENV on issues raised previously</p>
--	--	--