

## Procedure for reviewing external examiner reports

1. External Examiner reports are received by Registry via an online form. A confidential report can still be sent directly to the Vice Chancellor, to whom all external examiners nominally report.
2. The Academic Registrar or nominee “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.

(U)

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.

(LD)

A second flag of (LD) will be added to the grades of reports which are perceived to lack detail. The responsibility for following up on any reports lacking detail with the External Examiner will lie with the School. If the School deem the report to be unsatisfactory, and do not resolve this with the External Examiner, the Head/Dean of School will recommend that the External Examiner enters into the early termination of appointment process as per Section 42.5.4 of the Code of Practice. The School can request removal of the flag if they feel the report is sufficiently detailed. If the School is satisfied that the External Examiner has given sufficient detail, through communication with them, the flag will remain, but a record will be made (by the School) to note that further detail has been provided.

3. A member of the Academic Quality team sends the graded external examiner’s report to the Associate Head/Dean of School and uploads a copy to the Registry Information Page. The Associate Head/Dean 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 Academic Quality team is responsible for publishing all external examiner reports on Moodle so that they are available to students.

5. The External Examiner report is reviewed and a response to issues is documented.
5. 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 School Quality Panel (SQP), with responses to more serious issues approved by the appropriate member of the Academic Board, shown below:

	<b>Produce a draft response</b>	<b>response approved by</b>	<b>response from</b>
A	Programme Team	Head of School / SQP	Associate Head
B	Programme Team, School	Head of School / SQP	Head of School
C	Programme Team, School, Heads of	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 sent to the External Examiner by the School and a copy submitted to the Academic Quality team.

6. The issues, responses and analysis will continue to be included in:
  - i. the annual monitoring processes 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.