



External Examiner/Assessor Annual Report Form

(for internal use only – not for publication)

Academic Year:	2017-2018		
Name of External Examiner:	Dr Tchavdar S. Hadjiev		
Home Institution of External Examiner (or professional standing)	Belfast Bible College		
Programme of Study:	BA Biblical Studies, BA Christian Leadership, Grad Dip Theological Studies		
Modules examined: (where entire programme not examined)			
Subject Department:	Theology and Religious Studies		
Head of Subject:			
Programme Leader(s):	Catherine Shiells		
Site of Delivery:	Mattersey Hall College, Retford, Doncaster		
Mode of Delivery (delete as appropriate)	(i) classroom/laboratory (ii) distance learning		
Mode of Study (full-time, part-time or both)			
Date(s) of Module Assessment Boards attended:	12 June 2018	Date(s) of Awards/ Progression Assessment Boards attended: (where applicable)	
Number of years completed as examiner for this programme:	three		

Notes:

- The form should be completed in the format laid out overleaf by providing details in the comment sections.
- Comments should be provided for all questions, industry based externals should give a particularly detailed response to section 3 of the report form.
- Please **DO NOT** make comments on or name individual students or members of staff.
- Reports will be made available for students to view.
- An external examiner is entitled to write in confidence to the Vice Chancellor, University of Chester, should there be a matter which s/he does not wish to address within their report.
- **Please reference your comments as far as possible to specific modules/programmes where your report covers more than one programme.**

Please complete this Annual Report Form and e-mail a copy to the AQSS department at aqss.extexam@chester.ac.uk and also to the relevant Programme Leader.

The submission date for undergraduate reports is **6 July 2018**; for Undergraduate Assessment Boards held after that date, the submission date is 2 weeks after the date of the Board. The submission date for reports for postgraduate programmes with an Assessment Board held in January is **1 February 2019**; for Postgraduate Assessment Boards held at other points in the academic year, the submission date is 2 weeks after the date of the Board.

Please return your fee/expenses claim form in hard copy to the Policy Implementation Officer: External Examiners and Quality Support. Payment of your annual fee will be authorised on receipt of your report.

The examiner should clearly identify where any comments are specific to a particular site/partner, where a report covers provision delivered at more than one site OR at more than one partner institution OR at the University and a partner institution.

1 CONSISTENCY WITH REQUIREMENTS OF NATIONAL ACADEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE, INSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND/OR INDUSTRY PRACTICE (IF APPLICABLE)

(a) consistency with the QAA UK Quality Code and adherence to the University assessment regulations and requirements.

Comments: The College's practice is consistent with the QAA Quality Code. All the evidence I have examined suggests that the College adheres to the assessment regulations and requirements of the University of Chester.

(b) appropriateness of standards and assessment tasks with reference to relevant subject benchmark(s), Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ, the Foundation Degree benchmark (where applicable), industry standards and practice (where applicable) and/or programme specification(s).

Comments: The College's standards and assessment tasks set for the different modules throughout the programmes examined are at the appropriate level.

2 STANDARD OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE (in the case of Foundation Degrees please pay particular attention to the distinctive characteristics of the FD qualification)

(a) in relation to the specified learning outcomes for modules.

Comments: The anticipated range of marks and ability is evidenced, with some students performing very well, and achieving marks in the 70s and few students struggling with certain modules. There were some modules with no students achieving marks in the 70s but marking was consistent and robust. In few cases students did not achieve the learning outcomes and failed the assessment tasks because they submitted incomplete works. In all those cases the failed marks were appropriate and justified.

(b) in comparison with similar provision at other HE institutions.

Comments: The standard of the performance of students I observed is comparable to that of students in other HE institutions in the UK.

3 MODULES/PROGRAMMES OF STUDY

(a) aims and learning outcomes of modules/programmes: please comment on whether these were clearly defined and appropriate to the subject matter and the needs of students and, where applicable, their vocational relevance.

Comments: The programme is designed to equip students preparing for ministerial practice. To this end it offers an appropriate combination of modules dealing with biblical, historical and systematic theology and more practically oriented modules. The aims and learning outcomes are clearly defined. The programme gives students the opportunity to develop relevant skills. Recent changes have further strengthened this.

(b) learning and teaching methods used to support programme aims and intended outcomes (if external examiner has evidence of this).

Comments: The majority of students are residential, full-time students. In addition to lectures and seminars there are also mission trips.

(c) if applicable, please comment on the nature and extent of the evidence of independent learning, including, if external examiner has evidence of this, the resources for the modules and programme of study; e.g. IT facilities, library provision, specialist vocational resources (where applicable) etc.

Comments: As in previous years, the double dissertation module shows evidence that students are encouraged to engage in independent learning. The work I inspected across all modules also shows evidence of independent research and an engagement with scholarship which is commendable.

(d) Please comment on any aspects of provision relating to individual modules or specific programmes (e.g. Single and Combined Honours in the same subject)

Comments: I was pleased to see that the first year Church History Survey, on which I commented in previous years, is being replaced with a module which has a broader and more inclusive outlook.

(e) Please comment on the currency of the curriculum for the programme(s) of study and/or, where appropriate, the content of individual modules.

Comments: The curriculum gives opportunities to students to engage with a variety of pertinent issues. It was good to see in third year dissertations that dealt with topics like homosexuality, Black churches in British context and Biblical basis for the death penalty. However, the various modules could do a lot more to encourage students to engage with the modern context and to challenge them to interact in creative and constructive ways with the contemporary world.

4 ASSESSMENT

(a) variety and appropriateness of assessment in relation to learning outcomes and extent to which they enable students to demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes (please also comment on use made of formative assessment).

Comments: Most of the assessment is done by means of topical essays. Other modes of assessment include article review, exams, personal reflection, exegetical essays. All of these

are appropriate to the specified learning outcomes and students seem well equipped to deal with them.

(b) extent and quality of staff feedback to students in relation to their assessed work.

Comments: As in previous years, the feedback on assignments is detailed, helpful, constructive and contains specific suggestions for improvement.

5 LEVEL AND EFFECTIVENESS OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT (including provision of documentation from both the academic department and central support services)

Comments: Administrative support has been fine.

6 EVALUATION AND REVIEW PROCESSES

(a) formal methods of monitoring and evaluation to enhance quality, including the use made of student feedback on their experience

Comments: For each module the assignments are moderated by a second marker. On the monitoring forms the monitor ticks the marks between 40 and 69 with which she or he agrees and only gives marks and comments on works which have achieved marks above 70 or below 40. On some occasions I came across very robust interaction between the first marker and the monitor evidenced on the forms (in relation to failed assignments or assignments in the first class category). However, in most cases it is very difficult to see how robust the monitoring process has been because second markers do not routinely comment on scripts whose marks they agree. It was explained to me that the College here follows the University of Chester procedure. I accept this, although it seems to me that this procedure may result at times in the monitoring process turning from a quality assurance mechanism into a box-ticking exercise. Student feedback on each of the individual modules is collated and taken into consideration by the teaching team

(b) Programme Team's responsiveness to issues raised in previous external examiner's report(s).

Comments: The Programme Team have responded in a satisfactory manner to all the issues I have raised with them in previous reports.

7 COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

Please ensure you complete this section if your role includes the examination of work from a Partner College/Organisation, identify any issues (such as communication and

comparability of standards) which are specific to that work and refer back to earlier sections of this report where appropriate.

Your comments will be fed back to the Partner College/Organisation.

Comments: Communication with the Programme team at the College has been very good and the standards are comparable to those of other similar institutions in the UK.

8 SHORTCOMINGS OR SPECIFIC ISSUES REQUIRING ATTENTION OR DEVELOPMENT (PROGRAMME OR SPECIFIC MODULES)

Comments: It would be helpful for the team to work more deliberately on ensuring parity of the marking standards in different modules. There were one or two occasions where I felt marking was slightly more generous compared to other modules. It is important to engage in continued conversation across the programme that ensures all markers work to a similar standard.

This year I saw less evidence of excessive use of direct quotes in student essays, but there was still some of that. I would encourage the team to emphasise to students the importance of saying things in their own words.

It would be good to see a more conscious effort across the whole programme to help students relate faith to the issues and challenges of the contemporary world (like, for example, gender, female leadership, violence, dealing with the other, relationship between tolerance and truth).

9 EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE: STRENGTHS, OR DISTINCTIVE OR INNOVATIVE FEATURES

Comments: The feedback given to students is, as a rule, detailed and meaningful. Often the four rubrics (Knowledge and understanding - Critical engagement - Structure and argument - Communication and presentation) are used.

The marking standards are robust and scripts that do not meet the learning outcomes are failed.

Students engage with secondary literature and there is ample evidence of independent research.

10 IF THIS IS YOUR LAST YEAR OF APPOINTMENT PLEASE PROVIDE A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF YOUR TERM OF OFFICE

Comments: N?A

If you are responsible for a module delivered on more than one programme/site of delivery, please ensure that it is clear which programme/site of delivery your comments relate to.

External Examiner's signature T. Hadjiev

Date report sent 3 July 2018

External Examiners Report Checklist

Programme Materials

Did you receive:

Yes No N/A

- a. Programme handbook(s)?
- b. Programme regulations?*
- c. Module descriptors and programme specifications?*
- d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria?

X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

* these may be in the programme handbook

Draft Examination Papers

- a. Did you receive all the draft papers?
- b. (i) Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
(ii) If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

Yes No N/A

X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Marking Examination Scripts

- a. (i) Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts?
(ii) If you did not receive all the scripts, was the method of selection satisfactory?
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
- c. Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?

Yes No N/A

X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Dissertations/Project Reports

- a. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate?
- b. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

Yes No N/A

X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Coursework/Continuously Assessed Work

- a. Was sufficient coursework made available to you for assessment?
- b. Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?

Yes No N/A

X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you answered 'no' to any of the questions listed please add further details in the box at the end of the form.

External Examiners Report Checklist

Oral/Performances/Recitals/Appropriate Professional Placements

Yes No N/A

- a. Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct orals and/or moderate performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Module/Awards/Progression Assessment Boards

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting of the assessment board, or make any other relevant visit to the University or partner, during the academic year?
- b. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
- c. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the assessment board?

Yes No N/A

X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you answered 'no' to any of the questions listed please add further details in the box at the end of the form.

External Examiners Report Checklist – Comments

Please use this section to add further detail if you answered 'no' to any of the questions listed above. You may also add any general comments in this section.

If you are responsible for a module delivered on more than one programme/site of delivery, please ensure that it is clear which programme/site of delivery your comments relate to.