

Procedure for reviewing external examiner reports

1. External examiner reports are sent to the Academic Registrar. A confidential report can still be sent directly to the Vice Chancellor, to whom all external examiners nominally report.
2. The Academic Registrar or Deputy Academic Registrar “grades” the report into one of the following categories:
 - A suggested enhancements, or minor issues within a module or modules;
 - B issues with the programme structure, sequencing, or across several modules;
 - C major programme issues;
 - D highly serious issues concerning academic standards or quality processes;
 - E confidential report to the Vice-Chancellor.

For each grade, a flag can be added to show issues with the provision of central services or University-level issues. This is shown by a (U) character next to the grade to indicate there are perceived issues that do not directly relate to the programme and its delivery.

3. An acknowledgement email is sent from the Quality team in Registry to the external examiner, which indicates from whom a response will be sent. This will be different depending on the grade allocated to the report (see table below).
4. A member of the Quality team sends the external examiner’s report to the Associate Head with a grade from the Academic Registrar or Deputy Academic Registrar.
A member of the Quality team uploads the report onto the Staff Information Point for access by the Head of School. The Associate Head is responsible for its onward distribution to the members of the Programme team. Reports that receive a grade C or D are referred to the Chair of the Quality and Standards Committee (QSC).
The Quality team is responsible for the inclusion of all external examiner reports being published on Moodle so that they are available to students.
5. The external examiner report is reviewed and a response to issues is documented.
6. The responsibilities for approving the response and for contacting the external examiner depend on the grade of the report. Although the programme team may send a further acknowledgement to the external examiner, and necessarily will discuss the detailed contents, formal responses are mostly approved by the Heads/Deans of School following recommendations by the appropriate School Quality Panel, with responses to more serious issues approved by the appropriate member of the Academic Board, shown below:

	Produce a draft response	Response approved by	Response from
A	Programme team	Head of School	Head of School
B	Programme team, School	Head of School	Head of School
C	Programme team, School, Heads of Service	Academic Registrar	Academic Registrar
D	Programme team, Registry	Chair of QSC	Chair of QSC
E	As directed by the Vice Chancellor	Vice Chancellor	Vice Chancellor
(U)	As above, according to grade	Academic Registrar	As above, according to grade

The responses to reports received by the 1 August deadline should be approved by SQP no later than the November meeting.

The responses to reports received by the 1 November deadline should be approved by SQP no later than the January meeting.

Once approved, responses are submitted to the Quality team for central records.

7. The issues, responses and analysis will continue to be included in:
 - i. the Programme Review Report (PRR) for subjects, and their reviews by the Schools and by the joint meeting of the University QSC and Education Committee;
 - ii. the External Examiner Annual Monitoring Report; and
 - iii. the Annual Quality Report.

8. Separate Annual Monitoring Reports will continue to be produced for the Board of Examiners and for all External Examiners reports.