University of Wales
Prifysgol Cymru

Collaborative Provision Exit Arrangements

Handbook for External Examiners of Taught Degree Programmes

June 2016

**Prifysgol Cymru
University of Wales**

Collaborative Provision Exit Arrangements

Handbook for External Examiners

INDEX

1.   COLLABORATIVE PROVISION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WALES

1.1   Introduction

In October 2011, the incoming Vice-Chancellor of the University of Wales announced publicly his intention to bring to an end the University's then validation services model of collaborative provision. This intention was given effect by the University's Academic Board and Council that same month. All collaborative centres received a letter in February 2012, serving notice that the validation of programmes of study at each would be terminated at a date consistent with the contract governing arrangements in place.

1.2   The University's Exit Strategy

In line with this, the University has developed an Exit Strategy which has, as its primary aim, the achievement of an orderly withdrawal from all validated programmes of study in a timescale consistent with the contractual arrangements in place, and in a manner that protects the reputation of the University of Wales.

This Exit Strategy is based on two key principles and upon a number of strategic objectives:

Key principle 1:   The University should take whatever necessary additional steps necessary to assure the quality of provision and ensure the academic standards of its awards.

Key principle 2:   The University should fulfil its responsibility, irrespective of contractual wording, to enable students to complete their studies leading to an award in a way that is consistent with the relevant University regulations.

Pertinent strategic objectives are:

Objective 1: to assure the quality of provision and ensure the academic standards of UW awards;

Objective 2: to enable students to complete their studies leading to an award; and

Objective 3: to maximise the effectiveness of the management and implementation of the exit strategy.

1.3   The External Examiner Handbook

This Handbook is designed to be used in association with the University of Wales Taught Degrees Handbook, which contains the full set of Academic Regulations, protocols, procedures and guidance which provide the regulatory framework within which all programmes are delivered and within which external examiners are expected to operate.

The Academic Regulations of the University may be found at Appendix D.

Queries or concerns relating to anything contained in this Handbook should be addressed to:
Academic Unit
University of Wales
King Edward IIV Avenue
Cardiff
CF10 3NS

Email: academic.unit@wales.ac.uk

2. ROLE AND DUTIES OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

2.1 Introduction

This section describes the expectations of the University in relation to external examiner appointments. These are consistent with the requirements of Section B.7 of the UK Quality Assurance Agency's Quality Code for Higher Education.

2.2 Role of external examiners

Students who are enrolled on University of Wales validated programmes are properly regarded as being as much students of the University as those attending programmes of study at any one of the University's Accredited Institutions in Wales. In order to ensure the quality and standards of the awards at collaborative centres, the assessment and examination of a University of Wales validated programme must be conducted in accordance with the detailed and documented criteria agreed at validation and within the requirements of the Academic Regulations, protocols and guidance issued by the University.

External examiners play a key role in securing standards of awards. Normally, the University appoints UK-based external examiners familiar with UK sectoral requirements for all validated programmes delivered in collaborative centres in the UK and overseas.

External examiners are responsible for confirming to the University that programmes are operating at an appropriate standard. In particular, external examiners take the lead in ensuring that:

- the standards set for an award remain appropriate for the qualification;

- the standards of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which they are familiar;

- the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards were sound and fairly conducted and appropriate to the level of study.

2.3 Duties of external examiners

In fulfilment of this role the main duties of external examiners include:

- approving draft assessment and examination papers;

- maintaining an overview of marking standards through, *inter alia*, the sampling of student scripts;

- attending meetings of examining board as a full member in order to agree recommendations for final award results and classifications;

- providing a verbal report to examining boards on, *inter alia*, overall student performance and the quality of course and centre provision;

- for Master's schemes, reporting on individual student performance at Part Two;

- commenting upon the Annual Monitoring Reports submitted by collaborative centres;

- submitting reports to the University following the completion of an examining board meeting.

2.4 External examiners and moderators

The University appoints experienced senior academics to act as moderators who are attached to individual collaborative centres and play a key role in ensuring that collaborative centres comply with University regulations and operational and administrative procedures.   Moderators are charged with, *inter alia*:

- oversight of the quality of the student learning experience and the student experience more generally. Moderators are expected to be familiar with QAA expectations concerning the student experience and student engagement in their most recent quality codes (Chapters B4 and B5) and to help centres to meet them. Moderators are expected to meet with groups of student representatives to discuss their learning experiences, in line with QAA codes B4 and B5, and to provide anonymous feedback from these meetings to their centres and to the University of Wales.

- responsibility for reporting to the University's Academic Board, principally through the Degrees and Academic Awards Board, as to whether practices and procedures at the collaborative centre and the quality of the student experience meet the requirements of the University and of QAA quality codes and that adequate resources are being maintained and kept up-to-date. During the period within which the University's Exit Strategy (see Section 1) is being implemented, the role of the moderator is especially important. In particular, they have a major part in determining whether the objectives set out in 1.2 are delivered successfully. In fulfilling this role, moderators are expected to work closely with Officers of the University.

Among their other duties, moderators are expected to chair examining boards, and, in discharging this role, they are expected to work closely with external examiners in securing the standards of awards recommended by such boards.

2.5 External examiners and the University's Exit Strategy

As noted above, the implementation of the University's Exit Strategy is certain to place added emphasis on the role of external examiners as individuals with a major responsibility for securing the standards of awards at collaborative centres.

In particular, the termination of the University's contracts with collaborative centres may create circumstances in which centres may become reluctant to comply in full with the University's Academic Regulations, protocols, procedures and guidance. Such situations will require forceful, but tactful, intervention by University staff in general and moderators in particular. Although such situations may not affect external examiners directly, examiners need to be aware of the possibility of such situations arising.

The University will expect external examiners to support its staff, including moderators, in ensuring compliance at all times with the University's Academic Regulations, protocols, procedures and guidance.

External examiners should be aware that a formal validation agreement place is in place in respect of each collaborative centre which specifies the precise terms of each termination, including details of any further recruitment of students which a centre is permitted to make. The agreement also defines the responsibilities of centres in relation to the on-going provision of learning and other resources, and their duties in respect of adherence to the University's Academic Regulations, protocols, procedures and guidance.

2.6   Term of office

External examiners are normally appointed for three years in the first instance, but their period of office can be extended for a fourth year on a case-by-case basis, if the University deems such an extension to be both appropriate and justified.

External examiners should remain aware that the University is exiting from its current model of validation activities with all collaborative partners. As such, it is possible that a collaborative centre may find an alternative validating partner and exit prematurely from its agreement with the University of Wales. In such circumstances, external examiner appointments will cease at that time, or when the last cohort of University of Wales' students has completed.

3. OVERVIEW OF ASSESSMENT

3.1 Introduction

The securing of standards is in the interests of all parties involved. The following section provides on overview of the conventions that shape the pattern of assessment and examination of University of Wales programmes. The precise rules for examining particular programmes are contained in the programme regulations, and in the definitive programme document. These rules will conform to the University's Academic Regulations, protocols, procedures and guidance, published, *inter alia*, in the Taught Degrees Handbook.

It should be noted that, although moderators play an important role in ensuring that collaborative centres comply with University Academic Regulations etc., the key role in assuring academic standards through assessment is that of the external examiner. Where deemed necessary the moderator may provide the centre with staff development based on recommendations and issues in an External Examiner's report, particularly when those recommendations and issues relate to the standard of assessment material.

3.2 Assessment Handbook

The University has introduced an Assessment Handbook which sets out for collaborative centres to follow the University's requirements in respect of the approval and management of assessment material. It also provides information on the University's requirements in respect of moderation, double marking and feedback to students.

The Handbook also contains good practice guidelines on the development of various forms and styles of assessment.

3.3 Approval of assessments and examinations

The University requires that assessment and examination papers (in both the language of delivery and Welsh or English translations if necessary) should be prepared in draft some months prior to the assessment or examination period. Moderators are able to play an important role in this process through providing guidance and help to collaborative centre staff in preparing draft assessment material.

Once completed, draft assessment material is forwarded by collaborative centres to the University which, in turn, forwards it to external examiners to allow them to comment on the appropriateness, rigour and standard of the proposed assessment. The University has clear procedures for the process of assessment approval by external examiners and these are detailed in the Assessment Handbook. These procedures*, inter alia*, indicate clear timeframes for the assessment approval process.

3.4 Marking of assessments and examinations

The University has defined clear grade and marking criteria (set out in the Taught Degrees Handbook) which it expects internal examiners to adopt, and it will be for moderators to assure themselves that these criteria are understood and indeed being employed by collaborative centre staff.

The University also sets out clear policies for internal moderation and double marking, and it expects moderators to have a role in ensuring that these policies are implemented. It should be

noted, however, that moderators are not themselves expected to be involved in the internal moderation process.

Maintaining an overview of the effectiveness of the marking of assessments and the examination arrangements is an important role for moderators, and in this way, they support external examiners in assuring the standards of awards made by the University.

The relevant conventions and procedures are detailed in the Taught Degrees Handbook and in the Assessment Handbook.

3.5   Examining boards

Examining boards are part of the quality assurance process that applies to all university awards in the UK. As indicated in Section 2 of this Handbook, moderators are normally expected to chair all meetings of examining boards relating to programmes at collaborative centres for which they have responsibility.

One of the purposes of quality assurance processes in higher education is to ensure that standards for a given UK degree course are comparable with those of any other degree course within the same university and, by extension, with those of other UK universities. In chairing examining boards, moderators must be conscious that the involvement of external examiners in such boards is an important means through which the University can satisfy itself (and other stakeholders) of the comparability of its awards.

3.6   Examination of Part II Master's degrees

External examiners have an important role in the examination of dissertations (or Major Project reports) which are submitted for examination on completion of a Part II Master's programme. The outcome of such an examination is recorded on a Result and Report Form (R & R form). A copy of the report pro-forma can be found within Appendix C of this document.

The R & R Form is designed to record the mark recommended by internal examiners and that of the external examiner and requires a written report from both internal and external examiners. The R & R form must then be signed by the programme moderator.

The University would expect, as a minimum, that the external examiner should include the following within the R & R form:

- Detailed comments following examination of the thesis;
- Confirmation of the mark awarded;
- In the case of divergence from the marks of the internal markers, a clear rationale for why this is the case;

External examiners should ensure that their comments correspond to the mark awarded, for example, it would be expected that if a mark of 67% should be awarded, the comments would be suitably positive.

3.7   Unfair Practice

The University requires collaborative centres to ensure that students adopt good academic conduct in respect of assessment. It is essential that students and staff are made aware of the University's definitions of plagiarism and other unfair practice and the possible consequences of unfair practice -

which are contained in the University's Unfair Practice Procedure (set out in the Taught Degrees Handbook).

If any form of unfair practice is suspected, centres are required to refer immediately to this procedure, which clearly explains the process that should be followed. Examining boards must be informed of any unfair practice allegations and the outcome of any unfair practice process which has been invoked. A specific examining board agenda item (see Appendix A) allows for this.

External examiners should note that the University provides collaborative centres with access to *Turnitin* software.

In terms of unfair practice by graduates, the University maintains a separate process, overseen by Academic Board, for the hearing of allegations of unfair practice against graduates or other holders of its awards.

3.8 Arbitrating examiners – Taught Postgraduate awards

External examiners should be aware that when the decision of an examiner considering a dissertation submitted for the Master's degree by Examination and Dissertation gives rise to a case of dispute between the external examiner(s) and internal examiners it is within the power of the Chair of Academic Board, at the request of the chair of an examining board, to appoint another external examiner who will be asked to arbitrate. The Chair of Academic Board may take into account any written reports submitted by members of an examining board.

In choosing an additional external examiner the Chair of Academic Board may also take into account, but need not be bound by, the nomination (if any) from an examining board for an additional examiner. A decision on whether or not to reconvene the examining board shall be at the discretion of this additional external examiner whose decision on this matter shall be final.

It is advised that an Arbitrating Examiner be used if there is a discrepancy of 10 marks or more between the internal and external examiners.

3.9 Appeals

It should be noted that the principal outcome of a meeting of an examining board will be a series of recommendations to the appropriate authorities relating to student progression or awards. As such, appeals cannot be made until these recommendations have been endorsed by the University.

The decision of the University with respect to the progression or award for any student is usually final. However, students can invoke appeals procedures following formal notification of that decision. It should be noted that candidates cannot appeal against the academic judgement of the examiners.

The relevant procedure depends on the stage of study that a student has reached. Details of the appeals procedures (final award and interim) are contained within the Taught Degrees Handbook.

External examiners should note, however, that all students are required to exhaust the internal appeals procedures at the collaborative centre prior to submitting and appeal to the University.

4.   EXAMINING BOARD ARRANGEMENTS

4.1   Introduction

This section of the Handbook provides details of the University's regulatory and administrative arrangements for the conduct of examining boards.

The scheduling of examining boards is undertaken jointly by the University and each collaborative centre. Once a provisional date for an examining board is established, University officers will contact external examiners and moderators to confirm their availability. The University's Operations and Resources Unit will also make all necessary travel and accommodation arrangements for external examiners and moderators.

External examiners should not liaise directly with centres in relation to these arrangements.

Examining boards are normally held in the centre concerned. In certain circumstances the University may approve the holding of an examining board *via* Skype or the video conferencing facilities at the University Registry Building in Cardiff.

4.2   Functions of an examining board

The main functions of an examining board are to:

- ensure that the diet of assessment agreed for the programme being examined has been duly administered by scrutinising examination scripts, projects, course work, and any other evidence of assessment;

- ensure that marking has been fair, internally consistent, and consistent with marking in UK higher education institutions (UKHEIs);

- adjust marks, if necessary, to comply with the above objectives (marks for particular students in a particular module may only be adjusted by an external examiner if the examiner has reviewed all the student work in that module) ;

- ensure that students have satisfied the course and University Regulations in order to either progress or qualify for an award of the University of Wales;

- determine appropriate action, such as re-sits, for students who have not satisfied the conditions for progression or qualification;

- take into account any special circumstances that may have affected student performance in any element of assessment and apply appropriate measures if necessary;

- take decisions on any borderline cases;

- decide and confirm recommendations for final degree classifications and postgraduate awards;

- discuss any cases of unfair practice or other breaches of the regulations;

- make recommendations for future assessment exercises.

Prior to a formal examining board visit by the external examiner(s) and moderator, an internal examining board should have been held to discuss the results, including any inconsistencies, borderline cases and special circumstances, and to make recommendations to the formal examining board. The minutes of the internal examining board must be made available to all members of the examining board.

4.3   Composition of examining boards

Examination boards will normally consist of:

Chair	The Chair is normally the programme moderator. Any exception to this must be approved by the University in advance.
Moderator	The University appoints a moderator for each validated programme or group of cognate programmes. Moderators are charged with defined specific responsibilities intended to oversee the maintenance of standards and the enhancement of the quality of the student learning experience during the exit phase.
Course Teaching Team, i.e. the internal examiners	All staff involved in the teaching and assessment of the students should be members of the examining board and are required to attend the board's meetings. Requirements for attendance by internal examiners at final examining boards are described in the Taught Degrees Handbook.
External examiners	The appointment of external examiners is required for all University degree programmes. The participation of external examiners is crucial as no results sheet (see below) is valid unless signed by the external examiners. Recommendations for final awards can only be determined by an examining board at which at least one external examiner is present.
Registry representative	The University will nominate a representative of the Registry (normally a Senior Academic Officer) to review board papers and who will record the recommended results on an Outcome Recommendation Form (ORF)).The University may determine that the officer should attend a board in person, or participate via Skype or video conferencing where boards are held through this medium. The role of the officer is to ensure that boards are conducted in accord with University Academic Regulations (including quoracy). They will be a full member of the board.

As far as possible, all internal examiners are required to attend the University of Wales examining board. The following minimum thresholds for attendance shall apply:

- a minimum of 75% of students' assessed work must be covered by the presence of appropriate internal examiners;

- any person responsible for teaching 10% or above of a validated scheme must attend the examining board.

It should be noted that the moderator / external examiner(s) / Registry representative have the right to declare an examining board meeting null and void if it is not constituted in accordance with the regulations outlined above (and set out in detail in the Taught Degrees Handbook). In such circumstances, an ORF will not be completed and no recommendations will be eligible to be taken forward.

4.4   Conduct of examining boards

Examining boards are usually chaired by the programme moderator appointed by the University. The secretary (an appointed member of staff from a collaborative centre) will be responsible for recording the board's decisions and any other relevant matters in minutes. The collaborative centre is also responsible for ensuring that examining board recommendations are communicated to the

students in good time, and using a form of words specified by the University for this purpose which makes their provisional status clear. In this context, it must be noted that all recommendations for awards are subject to a final ratification by the University's Overarching Examining Board (see 4.8), and ultimately by the University's Academic Board.

The chair of an examining board is expected to ensure that recommendations for awards are made in accordance with the established guidelines for aggregating performance in individual areas of assessment, as specified in the programme regulations contained in the programme document. It is considered good practice to ensure that all members of an examining board are provided with a copy of the specific regulations covering the programme.

As noted above, an internal examining board meeting should have been held prior to a formal examining board. As a result of this, the course team should have already developed a consensus on any special circumstances (absence due to illness, etc.), or borderline cases and will be able to advance reasoned proposals, supported by evidence or arguments, for consideration by the other members of the board.

All members of the examining board should be provided with a set of spreadsheets detailing overall student performance in the modules being considered, as well as a final weighted average and recommended degree classification (if appropriate). It may well be the case that students being considered for a final award will have marks for modules approved by a previous examining board - these marks should be included on the consolidated mark sheet. It is useful to have a consolidated mark sheet in descending order of merit, as this will enable all borderline cases to be easily identified. This sheet should also show the average mark and the standard deviation for each module, as this will help the board to identify any anomalies, inconsistencies or possible problems with the module.

The consolidated mark sheet should be supported by information on the weighting of the different forms of assessment for each module (coursework, examinations, etc.). This information can be crucial to decisions on progression and/or compensation. It can also be vital when establishing the profile of students who are on the borderline between two degree classifications or the pass/fail divide. The presentation should assist an examining board to determine the classification of students' performances, i.e. to establish class boundaries.

Rank ordering individual student performances means that those students who are marginal between two particular classes (and between pass and fail) will be discussed at the same time. This will help promote efficiency and consistency in the board's deliberations. The mark sheet should have been amended to take account of any recommendations made by external examiners prior to the meeting.

In respect of the rounding up and down of marks, the University would not normally expect to see rounding up/down by more than 0.5% (e.g. 59.4% becomes 59%, 59.5% becomes 60%, 59.6% becomes 60%). Rounding should only take place once, as specified in any convention prepared for the purpose.

All board members must be provided with a copy of the examining board agenda, the minutes of the previous meeting and those of the internal examining board meeting.

The University's standard examining board agenda is given in Appendix A.

4.5 Examining board recommendations

Examining boards are required to consider a variety of circumstances and make a range of decisions. These may include:

- deciding on student progression;

- determining re-assessment requirements;

- determining recommendations for degree classifications at undergraduate and Master's levels;

- adjudicating on borderline cases;

- considering special circumstances; and

- considering the outcomes of an unfair practice investigation.

The University's expectations in each of these cases are set out in the following sub-sections.

<u>Progression</u>

The pass mark for a module at undergraduate and postgraduate level is 40%. However, each programme should have clear criteria on the requirements to pass a module - this might vary from requiring each individual component that contributes to the module mark to be passed to calculating a weighted average of the component marks. Whichever approach is operated, these rules must be clearly stated in the staff and student handbook and in the course document. Students should be made aware of the impact of individual marks and results on their ability to progress and complete a programme.

Students are required to complete successfully the full assessment programme for a particular level before being permitted to proceed to the next level of study, and students who pass all modules will progress automatically to the following year/ level of study. However, this does not necessarily mean that students are required to pass every individual element of the assessment. The cases of those who have failed some modules will be considered individually and in the light of the course regulations.

Course regulations must specify which, if any, of the following are appropriate.

Trailing	Which allows students to carry forward (or 'trail') failed modules to the following year (the University stipulates that no more than 40 credits can be trailed from one level to another). In exceptional circumstances a special case may be approved with respect to candidates needing to trail more than 40 credits.
Compensation	Means that a student is awarded a pass grade, in exceptional circumstances, for work which was not of the required standard. The practice of compensation operates in exceptional circumstances as specified by University Academic Regulations, and only when there is evidence of achievement / ability to 'compensate' for the failure.
	Compensation is not automatic but at the discretion of an examining board, which will normally consider overall student performance and the benefits or otherwise of compensation against re-sits or the resubmission of coursework.
Condonement	Means that a student would not be penalised in terms of progression or award for failure in elements of assessment equivalent to a stipulated credit value. Typically, programme regulations will limit the number of modules that may be compensated or condoned and will establish a minimum mark in the module failed to qualify for compensation / condonement.

The University's Academic Regulations set defined limits on the number of failed credits that may be condoned at any academic level. However, in general terms, the University would not expect more than 20 credits worth of modules to be condoned at any level, and no condonement to be given in a module awarded a mark of below 30%. Certain key modules may be excluded from the possibility of compensation, especially where they are pre-requisites for later modules, or where passes in them are required by other bodies, for example professional accreditation.

Condonement of modules at Master's level is not permitted.

In summary, the principal options for progression are:

- progress with no modules pending;

- progress after compensation or condonement (with or without modules pending);

- progress with modules pending with re-sits at the next available opportunity;

- re-assessment with progression dependent on passing a certain number of modules;

- repeat of the whole year if the number of failed modules is so large that re-assessment at the next opportunity is not permitted under the regulations;

- exclusion from the course if the number of failed modules is so large as to require a student to withdraw from the programme, the student has run out of time to complete the programme or has run out of re-sit opportunities under the regulations.

Re-assessment:

As indicated above, the pass mark for a module is 40%, and there need to be clear rules on the criteria to pass a module. Candidates who have failed a module are allowed to be re-assessed at the next available opportunity, once the failure has been confirmed by an examining board.

The University's Academic Regulations and the programme specific regulations detail the number of re-sit opportunities allowed. It should be noted that modules recovered after a re-sit or resubmission can only achieve the bare pass mark (40%) in the module concerned (as opposed to the component), regardless of the mark actually obtained.

A candidate at Master's level who has failed and re-taken a module cannot be eligible for a grade of Distinction in the degree.

Many programme regulations limit the option of re-assessment to a maximum number of failed modules (expressed in terms of credit) – a candidate who failed a large number of modules for instance might be required to leave the programme or repeat the academic year/level. Candidates can be allowed to repeat an entire academic level, and therefore the marks for the repeated level would not be capped. However, the marks for any modules in the level concerned that were passed have to be forfeited. This cannot be applied to candidates in the final level of their studies.

Where re-sit examining boards are held, arrangements should be made either for the external examiner(s) to attend the board, or to be provided with the spreadsheet of results and a sample of assessed work. In any case an Outcome Recommendation Form (see below) will need to be produced and signed by the relevant members of the board. The arrangements for re-sit candidates and any re-sit examining boards should be agreed at the main examining board.

Classification – Undergraduate degrees

Among the primary functions of an examining board are to make recommendations to Academic Board on the final awards made to undergraduate candidates, and to determine progression from the taught element to the dissertation element for Master's degree candidates.

Guidelines showing how individual elements of the assessment are to be aggregated must have been agreed with the University as part of the validation process of any programme and should form the basis of all examining board decisions.

The overall degree classification is frequently based on the average marks obtained at Levels 5 and 6. This is often a weighted average. Within a level/year, modules are usually weighted according to their credit loading. While some degree schemes give equal weight to each of the last two years, most will weight the final year over the penultimate one (e.g. 60%/40%). The actual weighting to be applied will be shown in the programme document and in the student handbook validated by the University. The marks required for each classification are defined by the University and listed in the University's Academic Regulations and are as follows:

First Class Honours	70 – 100%
Upper Second	60 – 69%
Lower Second	50 – 59%
Third	40 – 49%
Fail	0 – 39%

Classification - Taught Master's degrees: Completion of Part One

In order to progress from Part One to Part Two of a taught Master's degree, a candidate should have achieved an overall average mark of 40%.

In order to be awarded a Master's degree with Distinction, candidates should have been awarded a Distinction grade in both components (taught and dissertation) or have been more successful in the dissertation component than in the examined component, provided that the aggregate mark obtained is 70% or greater and no modules have been failed.

It follows therefore that candidates achieving a mark of 70% or greater in Part One, but 69% or lower in Part Two cannot be considered eligible for a Distinction overall. The following may be of assistance when considering eligibility of a candidate for the award of a Master's degree with Distinction:

Part One mark	Candidate is eligible for the award of Distinction:
65%	Where the Part Two mark is 75% or greater;
66%	Where the Part Two mark is 74% or greater;
67%	Where the Part Two mark is 73% or greater;
68%	Where the Part Two mark is 72% or greater;
69%	Where the Part Two mark is 71% or greater;
70%	Where the Part Two mark is 70% or greater;

The overall award is calculated by the University using a weighted average of the Part 1 module results according to credit weighting, added to the dissertation mark and divided by 2. The dissertation holds a greater weighting than the taught part of the degree programme.

Dealing with Borderline cases

When a student is on the borderline between two degree classifications or pass/fail, external examiners should normally look at all the evidence, including the student profile, but must pay particular attention to any arguments put forward by the internal examiners of the collaborative centre in favour of moving a particular student into a higher category or maintaining the classification indicated by the marks.

The University has agreed that a borderline candidate be defined as one whose classification falls within the 'window of opportunity', i.e. within two percentage points of the next category of award available (e.g. 58% for consideration as a borderline 2.i/2.ii), before any rounding has taken place. Examining boards should consider all students falling within the 'window of opportunity' and should ensure that any decisions are fully minuted.

There are two main methods which collaborative centres are required to adopt in their examining board conventions for discussing borderline cases:

Exit velocity	Where a student's classification falls within two percentage points of a classification boundary (before any rounding is applied), the examining board should consider the candidate's performance in the final year of study. Where the student's final year average is in the higher classification band the examining board would normally award the higher class of degree.
Preponderance principle	Where a student's classification falls within two percentage points of a classification boundary (before any rounding is applied), the examining board should consider the proportion of marks obtained by the student in each of the classification bands. Examining boards should only consider those marks which are used to calculate the final award classification. In order to be awarded the higher classification, marks in the higher classification band must have been achieved in modules attracting a credit weighting equal to half or more of those contributing to the degree classification.

Moderators should note, however, that some collaborative centres apply a marking scheme which is not based on percentages (e.g. marks are given out of a total of 80, rather than 100). Where such a system is in place, marks will need to be rounded up to generate the appropriate percentage mark. In such cases, a further rounding up process as descried here should not normally be applied.

Special Circumstances

The University's Academic Regulations and protocols specify what constitutes special circumstances, these include (documented) illness, accident, close bereavement or closely related compassionate grounds.

Candidates who have made known special circumstances that have affected their performance in an examination / assessment, or which has caused them to be absent from an examination /assessment need carefully consideration in order that the appropriate action can be taken. This might include allowing a candidate a further attempt at an examination/assessment without penalty.

It is a requirement to have held discussions regarding special circumstances prior to an examining board taking place – this might include a special circumstances committee that makes recommendations on each case or by holding a separate discussion with the moderator to discuss each case. Holding discussions beforehand ensures that cases are considered fully prior to an examining board taking place.

4.6 Comments by the external examiners / moderators

Following the consideration of students' results by an examining board, the Chair of the board should request external examiners to comment on matters covering the delivery of the programme – including teaching, examinations, marking standards, student performances, and possible future developments. Examiners should also be encouraged to comment upon any good practice or innovation they have identified. Where appropriate they should also allow the opportunity for collaborative centre staff to make a brief response, usually for purposes of clarification.

Examiners, moderators and University officers also submit formal reports to the University following a meeting of an examining board. External examiner reports are sent to the collaborative centre, which is required to formally respond to any recommendations which they contain. Recommendations contained within the confidential reports made by moderators are also forwarded to the centre and require a response in the same way.

4.7 Recording decisions of examining boards

For an undergraduate degree award examining board, or for an examining board at the end of the taught component of a Master's degree, all recommendations are recorded on an Outcome Recommendation Form (ORF)The ORF is supplied by the Registry and must be signed by all members of the board present, including the external examiners. ORFs are then returned to the Registry for processing and (where appropriate, and after approval by the University's Academic Board) issuing of pass lists and certificates.

4.8 The University's Overarching Examining Board

The Overarching Examining Board is a sub-board of the University's Academic Board and is charged with considering and, where appropriate, ratifying recommendations made by the examining boards for individual collaborative centre programmes. The Board then recommends to the Vice-Chancellor the awards to be made to candidates who are in good standing.

Once recommendations from a programme examining board have been properly recorded on an ORF, they are submitted to the Overarching Examining Board for ratification. Overarching Examining Board normally meets every six weeks, so that delays to confirmation of awards are minimised.

5.   EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORTS

5.1   Introduction

This section describes the University's expectations in respect of external examiner reporting.

5.2   Timeframe for external examiner reports

External examiners are required by the University to submit written reports following the completion of each meeting of an examining board which they attend. They are also required to submit a report at the end of their period of office.

Timeframes for reporting are as follows:

i.   reports on undergraduate programmes of study should be made within four weeks following the meeting of the final examining board;

ii.   reports on Part I of taught Master's programmes should be submitted within four weeks following the meeting of the examining board;

iii.   reports on dissertations for taught Master's programmes (Part II) should be made separately, using the R & R form enclosed with each dissertation.

External examiners should note, however, that if, at any time, they identify serious issues of concern which might prejudice the standards of the University's awards, they are empowered to communicate these issues immediately to the Vice-Chancellor.

5.3   Format of reports

Each external examiner is required to submit a report on each examining board to the University. A separate report should be completed for each distinct programme examined (different pathways within the same programme should be included in the same report).

External examiners are required to complete the following sections of the *pro-forma*:

Title page   Details of external examiner and the programme of study

Section 1   Standards
- Standards of the award, programme aims and objectives, standards demonstrated by the students, comparability of standards

Section 2   Assessments
- Design and marking of assessments, procedures for assessment and examination, participation in the assessment process, conduct of the examining board, quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods, administration of the assessment process

Section 3   Previous issues and action points addressed

Section 4   Additional Comments
- Identify areas of good practice, identify items for action and any recommendations.

Section 5   Feedback on the external examining process
                        -      Comment on the external examining process.

Section 6   End of term of office overview (where appropriate).

A report *pro forma* is provided at Appendix B.

5.4   Consideration of external examiner reports

The University attaches the highest importance to external examiners' reports, and payment of fees is conditional upon the receipt of a satisfactory report. Examiner reports form a substantive item at meetings of the Quality, Audit and Review Committee of the University. They are forwarded to collaborative centres and are made available to student representatives at those centres. They also form a substantive agenda item of Joint Boards Study meetings at collaborative centres.

Reports are reviewed by a senior officer of the University, normally within one week of their receipt, to confirm that they meet the University's requirements in respect of the rigour and comprehensiveness of reporting. Reports are then considered at the University's Quality, Audit and Review Committee (QARC).

QARC normally meets weekly to consider, *inter alia*, all moderator and external examiner reports received since its last meeting. QARC forwards reports to collaborative centres with a covering communication which draws a centre's attention to key points within the report (for example, action requirements or recommendations), and sets a deadline for a response from the centre to those points. This communication is copied to external examiners, who also receive a copy of a centre's response once it has been received.

QARC also maintains an oversight of the quality of reporting by external examiners (and moderators) and will communicate with examiners in cases where elements of a report appear unclear or incomplete.

External examiners should note that, in the event of an examiner failing to submit reports that meet the minimum requirements of the University in respect of rigour and comprehensiveness of reporting, the Chair of Academic Board is empowered to take such steps as appropriate to the circumstances including the premature termination of an examiner's appointment.

6. EXTERNAL EXAMINER INDUCTION PROCEDURE

6.1 Introduction

This section provides some information on the induction procedure for new external examiners.

6.2 External examiner induction

On appointment, external examiners receive an appointment letter detailing the programme(s), modules and award(s) to which they have been appointed. They are also provided with full information regarding the validated programme for which they are appointed. This includes:

- the Taught Degrees Handbook which includes, *inter alia*, the University's Regulations and Academic Protocols, and associated documentation;

- the University's Assessment Handbook;

- the External Examiner Handbook;

- a copy of the External Examiner's Report Form;

- full programme documentation, including programme specification (to be supplied by the collaborative centre within a month of appointment).

Each newly appointed external examiner will be expected to attend an External Examiner Induction Event as well as an appropriate briefing session with the Registry representative in advance of his/her first examining board meeting. This may be organised to coincide with the new examiner's first visit to the collaborative centre but can, exceptionally, also be undertaken via correspondence.

The induction session focuses in particular on:

- the nature of the validated award and the general structure of the University;

- the relationship between the University and the collaborative centre, with particular emphasis on the University's quality assurance procedures;

- the external examiner's role and responsibilities, and the extent of their authority;

- the University's Academic Regulations, protocols, procedures and requirements for assessment and award of its qualifications;

- the reporting requirements for external examiners;

- the main duties and functions of moderators.

The University holds annual training and development days which it invites external examiners to attend. The purpose of these days is to provide an opportunity for the University to alert examiners to any changes to regulations or procedures, or to any issues of general concern that may have been identified during the past year.

The training day also provides an opportunity for examiners to share their own experiences and to learn lessons from others. In so doing, this helps to promulgate best practice and to ensure consistency of practice among moderators.

7. ANNUAL MONITORING AND PERIODIC REVIEW

7.1 Introduction

This section of the Handbook deals with the University procedures relating to the annual monitoring and periodic review of provision at collaborative centres. During the period of the implementation of the University's Exit Strategy these procedures are likely to have an enhanced profile and purpose.

7.2 Annual Monitoring

Annual monitoring is a process of critical self-reflection and review that allows centres to reflect on the effectiveness of its programmes of study in achieving their stated aims. It is a means of securing the accountability of centre managers and programmes teams to the University.

The University therefore regards the annual monitoring process as a cornerstone of its quality assurance processes, and a key means through which it can ensure the quality of the student experience at collaborative centres. The annual monitoring report (AMR) is an important source of evidence that enables the University to reach a judgement of confidence in the collaborative centre.

The AMR provides an opportunity for centres to reflect and inform the University about, *inter alia*:

- how programmes of study have operated over the previous academic session;

- how programmes of study continue to remain valid academically and achieve the aims as set out at validation, and any changes that have been made to programmes of study and any that are intended to be made in the forthcoming academic session;

- any changes in resources or staffing;

- how the centre has responded to the comments of external examiners and moderators during this period.

The AMR also provides an opportunity for centres to comment on the on-going relationship with the University of Wales as the degree-awarding authority.

Full details of the University's procedures for annual monitoring may be found in the Taught Degrees Handbook.

7.3 Periodic Review

A new cycle of periodic review was established in January 2015, and since this time the University has undertaken an extensive programme of reviews. The decision on whether to undertake a periodic review at a centre was based on the number of students remaining, the centre's anticipated exit-date, and whether there was potential for the centre to transfer to the University of Wales Trinity Saint David upon merger.

This cycle of periodic reviews has now drawn to a close, however the University retains the mechanism to hold such a review at a centre, should it deem necessary.

Further details of the periodic review process can be found within the Taught Degrees Handbook.

8. JOINT BOARD OF STUDIES

8.1 Introduction

This section describes the role of the Joint Board of Studies (JBS) within a collaborative centre. The JBS is a mechanism through which the delivery of programmes is monitored within centres. The JBS also has a role in contributing to the management of the partnership between the centre and the University.

8.2 Purpose of the JBS

The UW Joint Board of Studies (JBS) has been in use across validated provision for a minimum of a decade, and has been a central point of focus for the maintenance of validated programmes operating at centres. Meetings of the JBS are usually once per annum, and wherever possible, meetings should be arranged to coincide with a meeting of an examining board in order to ensure maximum attendance from all parties, including student representatives.

Prior to the introduction of the exit phase, JBS were expected to take place once a year for each individual programme at a collaborative centre, mirroring the individual Annual College and Course Review (ACCR) procedure at the time. The JBS was responsible for, *inter alia*, receiving reports from the programme managers, reviewing reports and other documentation arising from QA annual cycles, approving amendments to schemes, monitoring of staffing.

It also provides a forum for more general discussion and an opportunity to reflect on the operation of the partnership between the centre and the University. In this context, during the period of the implementation of the University's Exit Strategy, the JBS has also provided an opportunity to discuss progress with the Strategy and the exit action plan agreed with the centre.

However, there have been several processes implemented during the exit phase that have diminished the importance and effectiveness of the JBS, in some cases. The University therefore no longer *requires* each centre to hold a JBS meeting, and instead the centre, together with advice from the moderator, should determine whether a meeting should be necessary.

8.3 Operation and constitution of the JBS

If it is deemed that a JBS should be necessary, centres would be expected to operate a single meeting to cover all the programmes that are validated by the University at the centre.

Membership of the Joint Board of Studies normally comprises:
- the University of Wales moderator (Chair);
- a representative of the centre management team;
- all programme directors / course leaders of programmes validated by the University;
- one or more representatives drawn from programme teams;
- one or more student representatives;
- relevant support staff (e.g. individual(s) responsible for learning resource provision);
- the University officer;
- the external examiner (in attendance).

8.4 Terms of reference of the JBS

The terms of reference of the JBS are as follows.

i.   To receive and consider the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) from the previous academic session.

ii.   To contribute to the development of the AMR for the current academic session.

iii.   To receive and consider reports from external examiners and moderators. These will be linked to the college's response to such comments and will be followed up at subsequent meetings.

iv.   To approve amendments to the structure / syllabus / assessment of the course or to refer such modifications to the University's Academic Board, through its Degrees and Academic Awards Board (in accordance with the Academic Board's criteria for amendments to programmes of study).

v.   To receive information regarding changes in course staffing, teaching resources, physical resources etc. and make any necessary recommendations to the bodies detailed under (vi) below.

vi.   To receive information as may be relevant from any internal college bodies or mechanisms, e.g. staff/student liaison committees, analysis of student feedback forms.

vii.   To consider such matters, for example, progress with the delivery of the University's Exit Strategy and agreed exit action plan, as may from time to time be referred to the JBS by either Academic Board or its Degrees and Academic Awards Board, or by the centre's Academic Board or similar body.

8.5 JBS agenda Items

Agenda items for meetings of Joint Boards of Studies will normally include the following:

i.   Minutes of the previous meeting.

ii.   Matters arising.

iii.   Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) (for the previous academic session).

iv.   Preliminary documentation relating the AMR for the current academic session.

v.   Student feedback on external examiner reports.

vi.   Proposed amendments to programmes.

vii.   Procedural matters (which may be referred by to the JBS by Degrees and Academic Awards Board or some other body).

viii.   Progress with the delivery of the University's Exit Strategy.

ix.   Any other matters.

Agenda papers should be circulated by the collaborative centre to all members in good time in advance of the meeting.

Minutes of JBS meetings are normally included in a centre's Annual Monitoring Report and, as such, are reviewed by members of QARC as part of the annual review of these reports. Action items (such as proposals for amendments to a programme of studies) are reported to QARC via the University officer attending the JBS and/ or the moderator (as Chair of the JBS). Issues appropriate to the role of the Student Engagement Officer may also be passed to this Officer, who is based in the University Registry.

9.   ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

The Operations and Resources Unit is the point of contact for all external examiner queries. This will include the arranging and organisation of examining boards, and the associated overseas travel and accommodation arrangements. Please refer to the University's travel and expenses policy for full details, including travel within the UK.

Submission of Reports and Claims

On completion of a visit to a collaborative centre, external examiners are required to complete the report template in appendix B. Completed reports should be submitted electronically within 4 weeks of the visit taking place to the following email address: academic.unit@wales.ac.uk.

Claims for fees **must** also be submitted electronically with the report to the same address using the standard claim form.

All claims for expenses **must** be submitted in hard copy with original receipts attached to the standard claim form to:

Academic Unit
University of Wales
King Edward IIV Avenue
Cardiff
CF10 3NS.

University of Wales
Prifysgol Cymru

EXTERNAL EXAMINER HANDBOOK

Appendix A: Examining Board Agenda

Examining Boards should conform to the following standard agenda:

Item 1:   Welcome

The Chair should welcome those present, introduce him/herself as the Chair and explain the purpose of the meeting, i.e. to confirm results of candidates pursuing a University of Wales validated programme. The Chair should outline the key regulations governing the meeting (i.e. those in the course document, supplemented by the UW Academic Regulations and protocols) and copies of the course assessment rules must be provided to all members of the board.

Item 2:   Apologies for absence

From those internal or external examiners who are unable to attend the examining board meeting.

Item 3:   Confirmation of membership, quoracy and conflicts of interest

The Academic Protocols specify that each examining board should include:

- chair (normally the Moderator)
- external examiner(s)
- internal examiners
- Registry representative, usually a Senior Academic Officer.

The University has guidelines on the number of internal examiners who should be present at an examining board in order for it to be quorate. Where the required numbers of examiners are not present, boards should be postponed.

Members should also be asked to declare any potential conflicts of interest.

Item 4: Confirmation of confidentiality of proceedings

To remind all those present that there should be no external discussion of matters considered during the examining board meeting.

Item 5:   Minutes of the previous meeting and minutes of the internal examining board

These minutes should be available to members at the start of the board, and any matters arising from the previous meeting should be reported by the Chair. Internal examining board minutes should have been made available to external examiners and the moderator at the start of the moderation process.

Item 6:   Outcomes from any verification and/or appeal cases

To receive reports of any cases which have been referred back to the examining board.

Item 7:   Personal/individual and/or general extenuating circumstances

In accordance with the Academic Protocols, an examining board can make decisions regarding candidates who have missed examinations for medical or compassionate reasons (defined in the Academic Protocols). Any such cases should be properly documented, held centrally and drawn to an examining board's attention in order that the appropriate action can be taken under (8) and (9). Ideally, these cases should have been drawn to the external examiners' and moderator's attention during the moderation process.

Item 8:   Unfair practice

Notification of any instances of unfair practice reported during the assessment period, and details of the action being taken in connection with the allegations (see University's Unfair Practice Procedure for further details on action to be taken).

Item 9:   Consideration of Module Marks

To confirm marks for cohorts of students on individual modules, using the spreadsheets to confirm marks.

Item 10:   Consideration of student performance (Progression)

To confirm the results for candidates not submitting for the final award, using the spreadsheets to confirm marks and re-sit eligibility. There can be discussion of individual candidates (e.g. borderline pass/fail cases, possible compensation / condonement cases, extenuating circumstances).

Care should be taken to ensure that the amended results are fed into the amended spreadsheets.

Item 11:   Consideration of student performance (Final Award)

To confirm the results for candidates completing the final award. This should be done using the spreadsheets to confirm marks and awards. There can be discussion of individual candidates (e.g. borderline pass/fail cases, possible compensation / condonement cases, extenuating circumstances).

Care should be taken to ensure that any amended results are recorded in the final spreadsheets.

Collaborative centres may also wish to report on final outcomes of Master's degrees which have been confirmed by correspondence since the previous examining board.

Item 12:   Report and feedback from external examiners and moderator

After the confirmation of recommended results, it is normal for the external examiner(s) and moderator to provide feedback on the assessed work that they have seen. The external examiner(s) and moderator will elaborate on this in their formal reports to the University. The

collaborative centre can respond to verbal comments, although it is best to not allow protracted discussions of specific issues at a formal examining board meeting.

Item 13:   Publication/notification of results / recommendations

To ensure that the external examiner(s), internal examiners and the Chair of the board sign the Notification of Results Form provided by the University before the end of the examining board meeting. One copy is retained by the collaborative centre; the other is used by the University to produce the certificates for successful candidates.

It must be emphasised that these results are in the form of recommendations (hence use of the term 'provisional') which are subject to approval by the University's Overarching Examining Board.

Item 14:   Notification to candidates of arrangements for deferral, referral, and re-sit assessment

To confirm the arrangements for informing candidates of the outcome of decisions affecting candidates who have deferred or failed.

Item 15:   Date of next meeting

To agree a provisional date for the next examining board, to be confirmed in writing at a later date.

Item 16:   Any other business

To discuss and agree other such business as may be required.

University of Wales
Prifysgol Cymru

External Examiner Report

The University of Wales requires External Examiners to provide a report on the quality and standards of programmes which they have been appointed to oversee. All examining boards must be approved by the University before they are undertaken.

Name of External Examiner and Title	
Name of Collaborative Centre	
Date of Examining Board	
Type of Visit: Examining Board / Skype/ Mid Term Visit/ Resit Board / Final Visit/ Other (please specify)	
Academic Year	
Title of Programme(s) of Study and approx. number of students examined: Pathways:	
Home Institution / other professional / institutional affiliation. If retired please enter last position e.g. Former Lecturer at xxxxx University	
Email address	

External examiner reports should be submitted in typescript within **one month of the date of an examining board**. Examiners should note that the payment of fees and expenses can only be authorised once a satisfactory report has been received by the University.

Please email the completed external examiner report form to: academic.unit@wales.ac.uk

Declaration: By submitting this report electronically, I confirm that I undertook the visit detailed above and the contents of this report are accurate. I also confirm that I performed my duties in accordance with the guidelines for the University of Wales External Examiner.

Notes on Completing this Form

It is important that external examiner reports are comprehensive and detailed and that the external examiner provides evidence and a clear rationale to support any statements made.

Master's Part One Examining Board

External examiners are reminded that this report form should only be completed for a Master's Part One Examining Board (taught element). Reports on individual dissertations (Part Two) are completed using a separate Result and Report Form. Submission of Reports

Where external examiners attend the last and final examining board, they will need to complete Section 6 of the report.

Please note that this report will be regarded as a public document within the University and form part of the documentation for reviews, QAA auditors and student representatives. Please note that under the Freedom of Information Act, the University might be required to release external examiner reports to individuals upon request. It is therefore important that individuals should not be named or easily identifiable.

1. STANDARDS

1.1 Standards of the award

Considering the level of the qualification and the subject area, are the structure and content of the programme appropriate, and is the programme capable of delivering awards of an appropriate standard?   **YES / NO**

Please provide a rationale and evidence for your response in the text box below.

1.2 Programme aims and objectives

Are the aims and objectives of the programme still appropriate for the subject area and relevant to the students?   **YES / NO**

Please provide a rationale and evidence for your response in the text box below.

1.3 Standards demonstrated by the students

Are you satisfied with the general quality of the students' work in reflecting the level of the qualification and the aims and objectives of the programme?   **YES / NO**

Please provide a rationale and evidence for your response in the text box below.

1.4 Comparability of standards

Are the standards of student performance in the programme(s) examined comparable with the standards of similar programmes in other UK higher education institutions?

YES / NO

Please provide a rationale and evidence for your response in the text box below.

2. ASSESSMENT

2.1 Design and marking of assessments

Are the methods of assessment, marking and classification of an appropriate standard, given the level of the qualification? **YES / NO**

Please provide a rationale and evidence for your response in the text box below.

2.2 Procedures for assessment and examination

Are you satisfied that marking criteria are applied with consistency, rigour and impartiality, and that internal marking is conducted in an appropriate manner? **YES / NO**

Please provide a rationale and evidence for your response in the text box below.

2.3   Participation in the assessment process

Are you satisfied with the opportunities which you were given to:

(a) approve the assessment material, whether written examinations, coursework assignments or other forms?   **YES / NO**

 (b) see samples of student work (including performances, oral examinations etc.)?
If not, please provide details.   **YES / NO**

Please provide a rationale and evidence for your response in the text box below.

2.4   Conduct of the examining board

Were you satisfied with the arrangements for the conduct of the examining board (module and/or programme)?   **YES / NO**

Please provide a rationale and evidence for your response in the text box below.

2.5   Quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods

What does the level of student performance indicate in terms of the quality of teaching, learning and assessment provided by the collaborative centre?

```



```

2.6 Administration of the assessment process

Were University of Wales procedures followed, and were the administrative arrangements effective?   **YES / NO**

Did you receive copies of all relevant papers, including the programmes of study, regulations, and marking criteria?   **YES / NO**

 If you have answered NO to any of the above questions, please provide further details.

```



```

3   PREVIOUS ISSUES

Are you satisfied that all points noted in your previous report(s) have been addressed appropriately and successfully?   **YES / NO**

Please comment below on the appropriateness of the steps taken to address the points that you have raised, and highlight any further action required and /or recommended for action by either the collaborative centre or the University of Wales.

```



```

4 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

4.1 Good practice

Please identify any distinctive or innovative elements of the programme, and any features of good practice.

4.2 Action Required

Please identify any items you require the collaborative centre or the University of Wales to take action on. It would be helpful if you could prioritise these requirements.

4.3 Action Recommended

Please identify any items you recommend the collaborative centre or the University of Wales to take action on. It would be helpful if you could prioritise these requirements.

5   FEEDBACK REGARDING THE EXTERNAL EXAMINING PROCESS

Please provide any feedback that you wish to give regarding the external examining processes of the University.

```



```

6   END OF TERM OF OFFICE OVERVIEW

If this is the end of your term of office as external examiner, you are asked to provide an overview of the whole of that period. The University is particularly interested in the following points:

i.   whether there is evidence that the quality of provision of programmes for which you have been examiner has been enhanced (or otherwise) during your period of appointment;

ii.   whether you are confident that standards of programmes for which you have been examiner can continue to be secured.

```



```

Signed…………………………………………   Date Submitted………………..……..

University of Wales

University of Wales
Prifysgol Cymru

Appendix C: Result and Report Form (R&R Form)

University of Wales
Prifysgol Cymru

Appendix D: Academic Regulations

A1 - Academic Regulations

for programmes of study approved by the
University of Wales for Delivery at Collaborative Centres

Taught Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates

Approved by the Vice-Chancellor, on behalf of Academic Board for implementation in respect of all candidates following all years of programmes of study at collaborative centres leading to awards of the University of Wales, with effect from 1 October 2016.