

SEN09D031

**Title: Learning and Teaching Committee – External Examiners’ Reports**

Author: Secretary, Learning and Teaching Committee with Assistant Registrars (LTQO)  
 Version: Final  
 Circulation: The Senate – 16 June 2010  
 Agenda: SEN09A003  
 Status: Open  
 Previous Ref: LTC08D098 & LTC09D136

---

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This report from the learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) has been prepared following detailed and thorough consideration of external examiners’ report at School, Faculty and University level.
- 1.2 The previous report to LTC was considered at its meeting in March, 2010. The report in March, 2010, addressed external examiners’ reports for 2008-09 hence this present report concentrates on taught provision. We are aiming to achieve swifter throughput, within one academic session or less, of the consideration of the overview report by the Learning and Teaching Committee in order to promote effective dissemination of good practice, share issues and discuss any implications for University-wide regulations, policies, procedures and practices.
- 1.3 The process for consideration of external examiner’s reports is governed by the requirements of the University’s Code of Practice on Assuring and Enhancing Teaching Quality in relation to taught programmes and the Code of Practice on Research Degree Programmes. The Codes take into account the roles and responsibilities of Faculties (in particular that of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee) and the Quality Assurance Agency’s Code of Practice, with reference to the sections on External Examining and Assessment and on Postgraduate Research.
- 1.4 As in previous reports, student members of the LTC, including the Academic Officer of the UEA Union of Students, the President of the Graduate Students’ Association and the Student member nominated by the Students’ Council have participated in the consideration of this report. The report will be made publicly available via the internet. The LTC believes that this remains a positive step in demonstrating that the University is engaging with faculty, external examiners and students in maintaining the standards of its awards and enhancing the quality of the student learning experience.

**2. Awards**

Session	Higher Degrees	First Degrees	Certificates and Diplomas
2006-07	1292	2263	825
2007-08	1434	2281	753
2008-09	1575	2264	735

(Source: Facts and Figures booklet, 2009-10)

**Appendix A** attached sets out the number of first degrees awarded, including classifications.

### **3. The Role of the External Examiner**

3.1 As indicated in Section 1.2 above, the role of the external examiner is governed by the appropriate University Codes of Practice informed by relevant external Codes.

***The purposes and functions of external examiners of taught awards are to ensure that:***

- the academic standards for each award are at the appropriate level and that student performance is judged against this;
- assessment processes measure student achievement against intended learning outcomes and are fair and fairly operated;
- standards at UEA are comparable with those of other higher education institutions.

***In order to achieve these purposes external examiners are expected:***

- to participate in assessment processes for University awards (taught programmes, including viva voce examinations where these are held);
- to arbitrate or adjudicate on problem cases;
- to contribute to the evaluation and consideration of the impact of extenuating circumstances upon students' performance;
- to evaluate assessment policies and procedures, including those with regard to professional practice, where relevant;
- to comment and give advice on the design of courses, on module content, balance and structure, on the appropriateness of learning outcomes, on standards of achievement and on professional practice placements, where relevant.

For postgraduate research degrees, the role of the external examiner is critical in the maintenance of standards and ensuring the comparability of awards. The UEA Code of Practice in this area continues to require that only persons of seniority, experience and expertise are appointed. The Code also requires the use of internal assessors where an academically qualified external examiner does not have recent experience of postgraduate examining in the UK.

3.2 The Senate is reminded that the institutional audit by the QAA in April, 2009, found that confidence 'could reasonably be placed in the soundness of the institution's present and likely future academic standards of the awards that it offers' and 'of the institution's present and likely future management of the quality of the learning opportunities available to students'. The audit report confirmed that 'the University makes strong and scrupulous use of external examiners in summative assessment and that institutional procedures play an effective role in the management of academic standards'. Scrutiny of the reports of external examiners between 2006-07 to 2008-09 (undergraduate and postgraduate taught) indicates that this confidence in the quality of the student learning experience and the standards of awards remains justified.

3.3 In terms of the procedure for scrutiny, external examiners were once again invited to complete a pro-forma report. In response to a number of views expressed about its presentation, a major overhaul has been undertaken leading to the introduction of a new pro-forma for use in respect of 2008-09. The new pro-forma (with appropriate adaptations for different types of provision, such as taught postgraduate, PGCE and Nursing and Midwifery) appear to have supported examiners in providing helpful and constructive narrative comments and to be easier to read. Publication of summary reports by external examiners is no longer required although the QAA continues to monitor the accuracy of the information that universities publish about themselves via institutional audit.

### **4. The Process of Consideration of Reports**

4.1 The process of consideration of reports by Schools and Faculty Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees (LTQC) regarding taught provision continues to be that in operation last session. Briefly, Schools are required to draft a reply to each external and to present

the report and draft response to their Faculty LTQC. Following scrutiny at Faculty level, the Faculties in their turn confirm to the Learning and Teaching Committee that the process has been properly undertaken, highlighting any University-wide issues and sharing examples of useful practice and enhancements.

- 4.2 In a continuation of the revised approach to consideration at University level in respect of **taught provision**, the Director of Taught Programmes has again selected one School from each Faculty and reviewed relevant external examiners' reports across a longer period from 2006-07 to 2008-09, inclusive. This approach has been adopted to track how Schools have responded to any issues or concerns and how provision has developed or been enhanced as a result. The exercise is also designed to discern features of good practice, to verify that standards remain appropriate and to determine whether the University's provision and/or the students' demonstration of the achievement of learning outcomes have changed/improved. A different set of Schools has been considered from the report to LTC in March, 2010, so that in due course, all Schools will be reviewed in this rolling programme.

The Schools considered in this report are:

**Faculty of Arts and Humanities:** Political, Social and International Studies

**Faculty of Health:** Nursing and Midwifery (post-registration programmes)

**Faculty of Science:** Computing Sciences

**Faculty of Social Sciences:** Law

**Appendix B** attached lists the Schools that have previously been audited in this way. In addition, the review has also ascertained that the process of consideration by School and Faculties in respect of the 2008-2009 reports has been appropriately carried out in accordance with procedure. Section 6 below presents the outcomes of the review with Section 7 considering the issues for the University raised by the reports.

## **5. Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Degree Programmes – action taken in response to issues arising from the March, 2010 report to Senate**

- 5.1 In the report to LTC and Senate of March, 2010, the following issues were featured, noting that external examiners laid different emphases on them:
- Use of the full range of marks and consistency of mark with marking criteria;
  - Provision of information to external examiners;
  - A specific comment regarding calculation of the aggregate mark which informs degree classification.
- 5.2 The University, via the Learning and Teaching Committee, is responding to these concerns by:
- continuing to urge markers to use the full range of marks (the Committee's consideration of comparative information about degree classification and about progression is relevant here);
  - asking Schools and Faculties to pay particular attention to and to keep under review assessment criteria (e.g. when a new module and/or course is proposed, during the annual monitoring of modules and course update and also at course review);
  - publishing guidance for use by Schools/Faculties regarding the number and selection of scripts and other information to be made available to external examiners, to amplify the requirements contained in the UEA Code of Practice on External Examining.

## **6. Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Degree Programmes: academic standards and the quality of student learning opportunities**

### **6.1 Process**

The process of consideration at School and Faculty level in respect of reports for 2008-09 has been undertaken in accordance with procedure and has been appropriately conducted. This has been verified by inspection of

the report of external examiners and the accompanying tracking forms used by Faculty LTQCs.

We received a total of 114/1116 reports from external examiners of undergraduate provision in respect of 2008-09. There is a process in place for requesting outstanding reports (up to three "chaser" requests), the sanction being withholding of the fee.

## 6.2 **Standards and Quality**

Overall, the reports for 2008-09 confirm that academic standards and the quality of the provision remain acceptable and comparable with other UK Universities (and at times exceeds them). This is echoed by the 90% of 2009 UEA graduates (first degrees) who in the National Student Survey expressed their satisfaction/high satisfaction with their experience (source: National Student Survey 2009). It is acknowledged that some graduates remain concerned about feedback on their work. This aspect has been addressed in part by the implementation of a new policy on coursework "turn-around" times. The Director of Taught Programmes and the Taught Programmes Policy Group are considering the most effective ways of providing feedback to students about their examination performance, with recommendations expected by June, 2010.

The University also participated in a similar review of postgraduate taught provision (the 'Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey – PTES) in 2009. The response rate was disappointingly low (12.8%) but 85.5% of those who responded indicated their satisfaction with the overall experience of their course. As with the NSS outcomes, an area that scored less well was that of assessment and feedback. Other areas with a relatively low score included aspects around the dissertation (understanding the required standards), organisation and management and career and professional development. The 2010 PTES survey is currently taking place. At the time of writing there has been a response rate of 17.7% which will provide a sounder basis for taking action on areas for improvement and enhancement.

Turning to the four Schools whose progress was tracked in terms of the views of external examiners over a three-year period, what follows are some illustrative comments about the nature of the provision.

**FACULTY: SCI**  
**SCHOOL: CMP**  
**AWARDS: BSc, MSc, MRes**

The following issues and themes emerged during the three year period of the external examiners' reports between 2006-07 and 2008-09:

### **Undergraduate programmes**

The School responses and Faculty consideration of the reports for 2008/9 was not available at the time of this report.

#### ***Points of commendation:***

- Confirmation of academic standards, which are superior to some equivalent programmes;
- Quality of student projects;
- Student work that compares more than favourably with graduates from other universities;
- Fairness and transparency of Assessment Boards;
- Use of group assignments;
- Modules that reflect the research interests of staff;
- Combination of coursework and examinations.

#### ***Issues which need further attention:***

- Proof-reading of scripts before these are sent to the external examiner for comment (repeated across years);
- Feedback on comments made by external examiners on draft examination papers / questions (repeated across years);
- Availability of a sample of all assessed work from all years for review by external examiners;
- The use of ICT to support the work of the Board and external examiners;
- Adoption of a problem-solving approach to assessment to test understanding and application of knowledge rather than recall;
- Greater clarity in the marking of scripts so that it is more transparent to the external examiner (distribution of marks, confirmation that section has been marked);
- Recommendations that the School review various second year modules;
- Mechanisms for ensuring consistency of decision-making on borderline cases across years.

### **Postgraduate Programmes:**

The School responses and Faculty consideration of the reports for 2007/8 and 2008/9 were not available at the time of this report.

#### ***Points of commendation:***

- Improvements to conduct of Final Assessment Board in the light of feedback from external examiners in previous years;
- Good mix of assessment types / modes;
- Variety and quality of dissertations;
- Quality and sophistication of the discussion between the external examiner and teaching team on matters relating to teaching and learning;
- Projects based on participating companies / relevance to the needs of industry.

#### ***Issues which need further consideration:***

- Feedback on comments made by external examiners on draft examination papers / questions;
- Mechanisms for quality assurance of examination papers.

### **Commentary**

These were a set of highly complementary reports.

There was clear evidence, particularly in respect of undergraduate awards, that external examiners had engaged with their role as critical friends of the School, suggesting issues for consideration as well as confirming key quality assurance matters. The available responses from the School indicated that (as confirmed by the FLTQC) the School was engaging with the issues identified and putting appropriate actions in place.

As with other Schools, the external examiners were complimentary about the administrative arrangements surrounding assessment.

One of the external examiners on the undergraduate programme has experience of programmes at European institutions (Ireland, France and Germany) and was able to comment on issues relating to the Bologna process and equivalency of standards.

There were some comments within the reports in respect of the possible future use of technology to facilitate the role of the external examiner, for example sending pre-assessment material to the external examiner in electronic format or sharing a sample of student work electronically prior to the meeting of Boards. It was also suggested that the data projection of detailed information as required for the discussion of an individual case might be used instead of copying and circulating a vast amount of Board documentation. It was also noted that the use of Blackboard for module information had limited the information that could be made available to external examiners since this no longer appears in paper format.

The issue of the use of a full range of marks seen in other Schools does not appear to be a feature of CMP undergraduate reports. External examiners do not confirm that a full range of marks are being used, but nor do they comment that a full range should be used. The use of the full range was mentioned in the report of one external examiner at Masters' level.

**FACULTY:** Faculty of Social Sciences  
**SCHOOL:** Law  
**AWARDS:** LLB, BA(Law), LLM, PG Certificate in Employment Law

The following issues and themes emerged during the three year period of the external examiners' reports between 2006-07 and 2008-09:

#### **Undergraduate programmes:**

##### ***Points of commendation:***

In generally positive reports on the Undergraduate degrees external examiners remarked that LAW provided '*a very competent and imaginative legal education*', was '*particularly good at encouraging students to think critically about their subjects*' and gave '*thorough - feedback to students*'.

#### **Postgraduate Programmes:**

##### ***Points of commendation:***

External examiners had high praise for the Postgraduate courses and the students taking them. A common comment was that low marks were rare and high marks were common, coupled with a clear view that the courses were fairly marked and at the appropriate academic level.

##### ***Issues which need further consideration:***

There are many issues that need looking at, some in the School, some in the Faculty and some at the University level. All are under consideration by relevant staff. A summary is:

1. Anonymity at exam boards. Those externals commenting on it (more than 50% at PG level) wanted exam boards to make decisions on student awards without knowing the names of the students. Typical reports noted that marking and handling of extenuating circumstances was anonymous and though '*there was no doubt [about] the impartiality of the meeting*' it would have been preferable to have been done anonymously.
2. Word limits. '*The requirements regarding word limits are curious. They are also cumbersome, and in some cases so Draconian – that I wonder if they are ever enforced...*'
3. Cross-discipline/cross-School matters. There were several comments about this including one where an external had sent comments on a LAW examination paper where questions were set by someone from another School, and another touching on the issue of marking cultures in different disciplines and asking for consistency in marking.
4. PG courses: a merit grade at 60% should be introduced.
5. UG courses with a year abroad: the School should be clear on how the marks for the year abroad are taken into consideration. [Note LAW is clear on this though it wasn't previously written into their exam board Convention; it also needs to be clear to students]

#### **Commentary**

It was clear that the issues raised by examiners did not detract significantly from what they regard to be high-quality courses with a high-quality student experience. It was timely for this set for reports to be considered in this LTC overview because of the various reviews and policy discussions under way; notably the review of CCS regulations which will soon lead on to a review of CMF, a review of the recently introduced Code of Practice on Placement Learning, and discussions at TPPG about anonymity in assessment and awards processes and consideration of acceptable policies on word limits.

**FACULTY:** Faculty of Health  
**SCHOOL:** School of Nursing and Midwifery  
**AWARDS:** Dip HE, BSc, MSc, post-registration programmes

The following issues and themes emerged during the three year period of the external examiners' reports between 2006-07 and 2008-09:

### **Undergraduate and MSc programmes**

#### ***Points of commendation:***

Over all, this was a very strong suite of external examiners' reports with particularly praiseworthy comments about:

- marking criteria and marking standards ('internal examiners consistently and appropriately applied examination criteria' and 'transparency at all stages of the marking system');
- use of the marking scale ('markers did utilise the range' and 'full mark range used across all work seen');
- the process of internal moderation ('system employed for moderation has been impressive' and 'moderation process very clear');
- feedback to and support of students (comprehensive feedback to students'; 'steady and consistent increase in the standard of student work - particularly in midwifery' and 'during my tenure, I have seen the feedback from markers improve');
- learning outcomes ('units (modules) are complementary and this complementary framework plays a significant role in helping candidates achieve the programme's over all learning outcomes') and
- academic standards ('higher side of comparable'; and 'standards are very high and are more rigorously applied..').

The external examiners were also very complimentary about the support given by administrative colleagues, appreciating the regular communications about despatch of documents and information about the programmes ('the work of administrative staff was excellent'), and the conduct of Boards of Examiners which were described as ('conducted in a professional and efficient manner' and 'all decision were transparent and the opinion of the external examiners seems to be valued'). The reports highlighted these as items for wider dissemination.

#### ***Issues which need further attention:***

There were very few issues drawn to the attention of the School. The few matters that were flagged were constructively offered as potential further improvements, for example 'more scope for devising more explicit way to provide evidence of internal moderation agreement process where there is significant difference in the marking band' and 'more opportunity (*for external examiners*) to review how essential skills clusters are being achieved'. There were no critical action points regarding academic standards or the academic experience. Nor were there action points for the Faculty or the University although one examiner expressed surprise at how few lecturers involved with the course (an MSc) had attended the Board of Examiners and another commented on the fiscal merits of on-line submission and marking of work.

#### **Commentary**

This set of reports indicates that the School is responding well to requests and comments by external examiners. Given that marking criteria, internal moderation standards and feedback to students are important areas that are or will be under review by the University's Taught Programmes Policy Group, it will be useful to hear more from the School about its procedures and how they are implemented.

**FACULTY:** Faculty of Arts and Humanities  
**SCHOOL:** Political Social and International Studies  
**AWARDS:** BA and MA

The following issues and themes emerged during the three year period of the external examiners' reports between 2006-07 and 2008-09:

### **Undergraduate programmes**

#### ***Points of commendation:***

- Teaching and learning methods are well planned and well matched to the needs of the students at different levels within the programmes and on different modules;
- Teaching standards were described as excellent. The students' work provided lots of evidence of the impact and result of very high quality teaching, undertaken by enthusiastic and research active staff;
- The content of the programmes were seen as challenging and up to date and new modules coming on stream in future years were seen as further strengthening the "menu";
- Assessment methods were seen as varied and innovative. ("There is an impressive range of methods here, with some innovative aspects: "campaign reports" (on US politics), rolling seminar papers (Middle East politics), book reviews, long and short essays. Theakston, 2008-09);
- Marking standards were deemed to be appropriate and the marking of work was fair and, even-handed and consistent between different markers;
- Paperwork provided to external examiners was very useful and informative and helped them in their deliberations. ("I was provided with clear information about marking and assessment criteria, course content and learning outcomes. I have no suggestion for improvement. The comments from markers were very helpful. Some markers included a letter with additional comments on the marks, drawing attention to particular issues. This was particularly useful and provided instructive analysis." Caney, 2008-09);
- External examiners were impressed by the excellent conduct of examination boards. They appreciated statistics regarding borderline cases from previous year and thought that such an approach ensured that there was consistency in the decision making of the award of classifications. ("I was impressed with the careful consideration of borderline cases at the Final Exam Board, using full information on precedents and calculations from previous years to help the decision making – something which establishes a degree of equity between cohorts of students in different years." Theakston, 2007-08).

#### ***Issues which need further attention:***

- Some standardisation of assessment methods is recommended to encourage the degree of consistency in how coursework is assessed. A tick box form based on marking descriptors ought to be introduced;
- Feedback to students on their examination performance principally at level 2 should be provided by the School to enable them to learn lessons for future examinations;
- Recommendation to review policy and practice of with regard to the place of the multiple choice element of some examination papers and particularly the percentage of multiple choice elements of some examination papers in comparison with the overall examination mark;
- Review year weightings for year 2 and year 3 of honours degree programmes to account for exit velocity of third year students as currently year 2 and year 3 count equally towards the degree classification;
- If candidates receive a mark ending in a 9 as an overall module mark, a second process of scrutiny should be applied for the module organiser to review such marks again to eliminate ambiguity if this particular mark is definitely a borderline mark or not.

## **Postgraduate Programmes:**

### ***Points of commendation:***

- The structure of the programme was well designed, students can take a great variety of types of modules and this breadth is reflected in the interesting and challenging dissertations which the students produce. The structure of the programme ensures that students get a great theoretical and empirical introduction and overview of the Social Sciences;
- Teaching is of a high calibre, well thought-out, interesting and thorough. The modules cover a large amount of material and do so in considerable depth;
- The commitment of the teaching staff to their students was highly praised. This was reflected in a detailed level of feedback for assessed work, where students understand very clearly how they have obtained their particular mark. External examiners were particularly impressed at how seriously second markers take their role and as they frequently provided very detailed comments;
- The organisation of the meeting of the Board of Examiners was very efficient and coherent. The Chairman of Examiners was praised for the clarity of information and detailed instructions which were sent out to the external examiner before the meeting;

### ***Issues which need further consideration:***

- Markers should not hesitate to make use of the full range of marks and award marks in excess of 80% if they agree that the work merits this;
- If students take modules from other Schools, marking criteria may vary and students may risk an anomalous mark and therefore close scrutiny is needed where this might occur;
- Although academic standards were judged to be excellent by external examiners, one external examiner expressed concern regarding the number of failures amongst a specific group of international students.

### **Commentary**

The School is responsive to comments made by external examiners and promptly addresses issues of concerns which have been identified. External examiners have noted the School's replies with some satisfaction. One external examiner notes that issues with multiple choice questions had been addressed satisfactorily by the School in response to his comments. Equally, there is also evidence that the School has a standardised coursework feedback coversheet as suggested by the same external examiner in a previous year.

## **7. Issues for the University arising from external examiners' reports on taught provision**

- 7.1 The reports continue to comment on assessment themes which have previously been raised by other external examiners, viz, use of the full range of marks, consistency of mark with marking criteria, marking procedures, consistency of decisions around borderlines and feedback to students. There were also some comments about responses to external examiners regarding draft examination papers (Computing Sciences and Law), year weightings between levels 2 and 3, the multiple choice element in some examination papers and failure rate amongst a group of international students (Political, Social and International Studies) and an issue regarding word limits and clarity regarding the contribution of the year abroad to the final degree outcome (Law). Some of these issues are specific to the School concerned but some (the issues regarding marking, for instance, and the failure rate of a group of international students) are of wider import. In addition, the external examiners for Law suggested that the Board of Examiners should not be aware of the names of candidates and also proposed the introduction of a merit ('credit') classification in respect of the taught master's degree.

7.2 The Learning and Teaching Committee has repeatedly urged Faculties and Schools (and they in their turn have done likewise) to encourage markers to use the full range. A range of approaches has been used to help raise awareness:

- provision of management information on degree/progression outcomes, including subject comparisons across the sector;
- use of opportunities to monitor and review assessment criteria and consistency between marks and criteria, for example, via the annual module monitoring and course update and review procedure;
- sharing of outcomes of academic appeals via the 'Academic Practice' sessions offered through the Centre for Staff and Educational Development;
- use of other opportunities to share practice (eg through the Learning and Teaching Day).

Improved feedback to students about their performance has been under consideration by the Taught Programmes Policy Group. Recommendations are expected to be laid before the Committee at its next meeting.

Where this was raised as an issue, Schools should set out in their responses to External Examiners' reports (noting that such responses are a requirement of the UEA Code of Practice on External Examining) how they are going to improve marking and moderation procedures. In this regard, it is noted that external examiners of the School of Nursing and Midwifery were very complimentary about the procedures in operation in that School and other Schools may wish to learn from this good practice. Schools are also reminded that it is a requirement of the UEA Code of Practice that they must engage with external examiners about draft examination questions.

The School of Political, Social and International Studies will be asked to review and comment on in its response to the external examiners regarding failure rates and the School of Law will be invited to consider its approach its policy on word limits.

At present, it is a matter for individual School Boards as to whether they candidates' names are known at the time that the Boards meet (noting that examination scripts and substantive coursework are anonymised). Practice therefore varies and is an area that the Taught Programmes Policy Group/review of Common Course Structure Degree Regulations (CCS) will consider. Following completion of the review of CCS Regulations, the implications for the Common Master Framework will be examined. It seems appropriate therefore to consider the issue of the possible introduction of a merit classification as part of this review.

## 8. Conclusion and Recommendations

Taking all the above in account, the Learning and Teaching Committee is pleased to confirm to the Senate that:

- academic standards and the quality of provision as commented upon by external examiners in respect of taught provision at undergraduate, and master's level remain acceptable and comparable with, and in some cases exceed, those of other UK Universities;
- academic standards and the quality of provision as commented upon by external examiners in respect of research degree programmes remain acceptable and comparable with, and in some cases exceed, those of other UK Universities;
- there is evidence of generally sound and some outstanding practice in relation to the conduct and management of teaching, learning and assessment, to course content and, in several instances, to the feedback given to students;
- Schools and Faculties for the most part continue to consider and respond to the issues raised by external examiners but there is scope for improvement in some areas;

- Schools and Faculty LTQCs should continue to utilise a range of approaches to encourage markers to use the full range of the marking scale;
- Schools and Faculty LTQCs should pay particular attention to and keep under review, assessment criteria and ensure a consistent relationship between marks and the relevant criteria;
- there are further developments that are being championed by the Learning and Teaching Committee (as set out in Section 7.2 above).

8.2 The Committee is asked to approve the draft report subject to confirmation that the process of consideration has been completed in the Faculty of Science in accordance with University procedures. Should that confirmation be received prior to the meeting of Senate on 16 June, it will be reported to Senate that the Learning and Teaching Committee commends to it this report. If accepted by the Senate, the report will then be placed on the LTQ website.

**APPENDIX A**

Of the first degrees awarded, these were classified as follows:

<b>SESSION</b>			
<b>Class</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
<b>First</b>	228 (10)	286 (12)	281 (12)
<b>Upper Second</b>	1231 (54)	1285 (56)	1253 (55)
<b>Lower Second</b>	602 (27)	536 (23)	535 (24)
<b>Third</b>	98 (4)	76 (3)	78 (3)
<b>Ordinary Pass</b>	9 (1)	3 (1)	12 (1)
<b>MBBS</b>	95 (4)	95 (4)	103 (5)
<b>Other Unclassified Honours</b>	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
<b>TOTAL</b>	2263 (100)	2281 (100)	2264 (100)

\* (Figures in brackets are percentages)

\*\* (A degree that is awarded on a pass/fail basis)

**APPENDIX B**

<b>FACULTY</b>				
<b>Report to LTC/Senate In Session</b>	<b>Arts and Humanities Schools</b>	<b>Health Schools</b>	<b>Science Social Schools</b>	<b>Science Schools</b>
<b>2007-08</b>	World Art Studies and Museology	Medicine, Health Policy and Practice	Development Studies	Mathematics
<b>2008-09</b>	Literature and Creative Writing	Allied Health Professions	Norwich Business School	Chemical Sciences and Pharmacy
<b>2009-10</b>	Political, Social and International Studies	Nursing and Midwifery (post-registration)	Law	Computing Sciences