Trinity College Dublin

Quality Committee

Minutes

Minutes of the meeting of the Quality Committee held on 7 May 2015 in the Boardroom, House 1.

Present:	Dean of Undergraduate Studies (Acting Chair), Chief Operating Officer, Dean of Graduate Studies, Academic Secretary, Quality Officer, Professor Sheila Ryder, Professor Catherine Coxon, Mrs Jessie Kurtz, Ms. Laura Conway-McAuley, Vice-President Graduate Students' Union.
In attendance:	Mr Declan Treanor (Director of the College Disability Service), Dr. Liz Donnellan (Secretary to the Committee).
Apologies:	Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer, Dean of Faculty of Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences, Dean of Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics & Science, Dean of Faculty of Health Sciences, Professor Simon McGinnes, Professor John Walsh, Education Officer of the Students' Union.

QC/14-15/047   Draft minutes of the meeting of the 27 April 2015
The minutes of the meeting of the 27 April 2015 were approved with one amendment to the wording of item QC/14-15/039. The last bullet point should read 'The introduction of a levy to fund student services requires a consultation process across College. Such a proposal, if it were to proceed must ensure that the Student Counselling Service continues to be free to students at the point of delivery.'

QC/14-15/048   Matters arising
The Dean of Undergraduate Studies reported that in relation to item QC/14-15/045, the revised course proposal templates have now been uploaded to the web and a communication will be issued to Heads of School and Directors of Teaching and Learning and Trinity's Associated Colleges.

QC/14-15/049   Quality Review of College Disability Service
The Chair welcomed the Director of the College Disability Service, Mr Declan Treanor to the meeting and invited him to speak to the Reviewers' report.

Mr Treanor began by thanking the staff in his office for their help during the review. He welcomed the Reviewers' report and noted that the majority and most important of the recommendations set out in the report are made at a College level. The Reviewers emphasise that students with disabilities are students of the College and not of the Disability Service alone, and as such the College should acknowledge its corporate responsibility to these students. Mr Treanor suggested that disability-related policies need to be embedded across College more widely and he highlighted the work of the Library in making material more accessible to students as a positive initiative. He undertook to address in the Implementation Plan how gaps in the provision of supports to students and staff across College can be identified, and to suggest where different disability initiatives belong.

The Reviewers identify the lack of an effective IT system as a major area of legal risk for College. Mr Treanor reported that effective IT systems via a disability module in SITS are required to introduce efficiencies in communications with relevant areas in College and free up valuable staff time to provide support to disabled students. The need for manual workarounds in the current system is not sustainable as it requires additional work and increases the risk of inaccuracies in information provided to Schools and other services across College.

The lack of a sustainable funding model for the Service was also raised by the Reviewers, and Mr Treanor reported that discussions are on-going with the Chief Operating Officer in this regard.

The Chief Operating Officer agreed that appropriate IT systems, the requirement for greater College responsibility for disabled students/staff, and the lack of a sustainable funding model for the Service are key issues arising from the report. She proposed that the development of a disability module should be dealt with as a priority in the next phase (G2) of the SITS enhancement programme, given the possible regulatory and reputational risk to College. In the meantime, the 'off-the-shelf' Customer Relations Management (CRM) option proposed by the Reviewers will be explored. She supported a review of the structure of the Service with a view to identifying disability initiatives that could be housed more appropriately elsewhere in College.

The Chair thanked Mr Treanor and the COO, and invited comments from the Committee. In the discussion that followed, the following points were made:

- There are a number of initiatives already in place across College to support students with a disability, for example in the areas of recruitment, admissions, and examinations but these were not acknowledged in the Reviewers' report;

- A review of the structure of the Disability Service is required in order to identify the gaps between the supports provided by the Service and those provided by other areas across College, and to identifying disability initiatives run by the Service that could be housed more appropriately elsewhere in College;

- Buy-in from the College community is required in order to ensure that the College takes corporate responsibility for services to students/staff with a disability;

- The role of the Disability Service should be to identify need and communicate this need to the appropriate offices/areas;

- The disability supports provided by Schools can vary widely with the result that students from different Schools can have completely different experiences of College. Support roles at School level such as that of Academic Liaison Officer should be clarified and/or redefined to ensure that a standardised level of support is available to students across Schools and Faculties. The possibility of providing supports at Faculty level should also be considered.

The Chair thanked the Committee and reported that the Reviewers' Report and responses from the Director of the Disability Service and the Chief Operating Officer will go to Board on the 27 May, along with the minute of the Quality Committee discussion.

QC/14-15/050   External Examiners policy, process map and report template (see Appendix 1)
The Chair invited the Quality Officer to speak to the External Examiners policy, process map and report template which were circulated with papers for the meeting. The Quality Officer began by reporting that a finance review of the External Examiners process had been undertaken by START, which had resulted in three key changes;

- Responsibility for payment of External Examiners now rests solely with Schools;
- Examiners are now only required to complete one claim form for their fee and expenses rather than separate forms for each, as was the case previously;
- Payment of the External Examining fee will be made concurrently with payment for expenses rather than on submission of the annual report.

The second phase of this project involved the development of an External Examiners policy and a documented procedure for External Examining at both undergraduate and postgraduate level. The Quality Officer reported that a single template for the External Examiners' report has been developed to replace the three currently in existence, with a view to on-line completion and submission of External Examiners' reports once a suitable portal has been developed. This is currently under consideration by IS Services with an implementation timeframe at least two years away. A deadline of eight weeks for return of completed annual reports has been introduced and will be communicated to external examiners in order to reduce delays in return of the completed reports.

The Committee discussed the policy, the procedure as outlined in the process map, and the template for the External Examiners' report, and a number of clarifications/amendments were suggested as follows:

- In Section 7.1 (iv) of the policy document, the role of the External Examiner in moderating borderline cases should be emphasized, as in many institutions the External Examiner no longer has a moderating role;
- In Section 7.2 (v) b, the sentence should be amended to read 'A viva voce examination is mandatory in cases where one or both examiners contemplate failure of the Master's thesis, or recommend that the thesis is referred for major corrections;
- In Section 7.3.1, point number iii which states that 'external examiners should not have any existing or recent relationship with Trinity, members of its staff or students that could call their impartiality into question' should be replicated in section 7.3.2.
- In section 7.3.2 (iii), the policy should specify that the external examiner should not be a graduate of Trinity in the last 10 years;
- In section 7.5 (iv) the phase 'research examinations' should be amended to read 'research dissertations' as the policy does not apply to research theses; similarly in section 7.5 (v) 'research examinations' should be amended to read 'research dissertations';
- In section 7.6 (i), the sentence should be amended to specify that Trinity pays its External Examiners at a fixed rate and not a fixed daily rate;
- In the External Examiner report template, the introductory section which asks the Examiner to indicate the 'current academic year' should be amended to specify that the information required relates to the current term year of the Examiner.

The Quality Officer thanked the Committee for its input and undertook to make the suggested changes and bring the document back to the next Committee meeting for noting.

QC/14-15/051   Education Recruitment Agents Policy
The Dean of Undergraduate Studies invited the Quality Officer to speak to the Education Recruitment Agents Policy which was circulated with papers for the meeting. The Quality Officer reported that the policy had been developed in anticipation of the publication by QQI of a *Code of Practice for Providers of Programmes of Education and Training to International Students* and

following discussion with Global Relations and the Financial Services Division (FSD) about where gaps exist against this code. It is anticipated that this policy will support the strategic plan target for international student recruitment. The Quality Officer informed the Committee that the Code of Practices requires due diligence to be conducted on potential agents and a periodic review process to be conducted on Agents under contract. A constraint is that the SITS system does not currently allow identification of students coming to College through services provided by Agents.

The Chair thanked the Quality Officer and invited comment from the Committee. In the ensuing discussion the following issues and queries were raised:

- Does College conduct a tender process for Agents? If not, how are they recruited or recommended, and who currently carries out due diligence checks on them?

- Are Agents paid on a commission basis?

- How many Agents does TCD currently have?

- What is the legal recognition of the international contract that TCD has with Agents in the jurisdiction where the Agent operates? What is the standing of the London Statement Principles[1] in these jurisdictions i.e. it's enforceability?

- Does the Data Protection Act apply to student information after the student graduates or just when they are registered? Will their information be transmitted to a 3rd party i.e. Agent?

- Is it possible to get a list of recognised Agents published on the Global Relations website? Schools have reported having interactions with students who have been made promises by Agents who are not engaged by Trinity and therefore have expectations of a place that cannot be met.

The Chair thanked the Quality Officer and suggested that a representative from Global Relations be invited to attend the next meeting of the Quality Committee to speak to the issues raised in the discussion.

QC/14-14/052   Revised Procedure for review of a Trinity Research Institute (TRI)
The Quality Officer spoke to the Procedure for review of a Trinity Research Institute (TRI) which had been amended following feedback from the Quality Committee on the 27th April 2015. She reported that the document had been strengthened to reflect the key role of the Heads of participating Schools and the relevant Faculty Dean in the governance of the TRIs. Section 5.1 of the procedure has been revised to include specific reference to Heads of School and representatives from governance structures in the composition of the Coordinating Group. Appendix 2, which outlines suggested headings for the Self-Assessment Report, now asks that the relationship across participating Schools is included in the description of the governance and management structure.

A short discussion ensued in which it was suggested that in section 5.1, Principal investigators would be more appropriately listed directly before Directors of TRCs.

The Committee approved the procedure with one minor change and the discussion closed.

---

[1] Also known as the Statement of Principles for the Ethical Recruitment of International Students by Education Agents and Consultants

QC/14-15/053   QQI update May 2015

The Quality Officer spoke to an update from QQI on the development and implementation of QQI quality assurance guidelines for Designated Awarding Bodies (DABs), and the authorization of the International Education Mark (IEM). She reported that the planned programme of work with QQI was delayed due to a number of issues arising from a recent High Court case involving ACELS (English Language Recognition Scheme). One of the key issues relates to the lack of a definition of 'recognition within the framework' referred to in the 2012 Act as being a pre-condition of IEM authorization. A clear definition is required in legislation and this may require an amendment to the 2012 Act. In addition regulatory reforms will affect how QQI awards the IEM and these have been delayed going to Cabinet by the High Court case. It appears that there may be different processes for IEM authorization for Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and English Language Programmes. The Quality Officer reported that the timetable for implementation of the IEM has been impacted by these issues and will not commence in 2015 as anticipated.

The Academic Secretary stressed the importance of ensuring that the same IEM would not apply to Universities as to the English Language sector, as there is a reputational issue regarding the promotion of Irish education overseas if there is not a differentiation. While there is on-going lobbying through the IUA on this matter, she suggested that there is a need to inform and highlight to Senators the reputational risk, and undertook to take this forward.

QC/14-15/054   Revised Student Complaints Procedure

The Quality Officer introduced a revised draft of the Student Complaints Procedure which had been discussed at last meeting. The amended version incorporates feedback from the Committee and is presented in the new standardized format for quality policies and procedures.

In the discussion that followed, the following points were raised in relation to Section 4.5.1:

- In section (ii) clarification should be sought as to why a cut-off point of three months following final assessment/examination has been set for receipt of complaints;

- Regarding section (ii), does the three month cut-off point refer to complaints relating to research supervisors?

- In section (iii), the wording should be reviewed to clarify that those referred to in the first half of the sentence are 'applicants'. The second half of the sentence referring to those 'off-books' should form a separate bullet point.

- Is there a limitation as to how long you can be out of College before you can make a complaint?

The Committee approved the procedure and recommended that a revised draft incorporating the amendments/clarifications discussed should be brought to the next Student Life Committee for consideration before being forwarded to Council.

QC/14-15/055   Any other business

The Quality Officer reported that the annual survey to Quality Committee members on the performance of the Committee would be issued shortly.

Appendix 1: External Examiners Policy and Report Template

External Examiners Policy

1.   Context

As a designated awarding body, Trinity College Dublin, the University of Dublin, is responsible for the establishment and granting of awards, in alignment with the Irish National Framework of Qualifications. Trinity engages external examiners to evaluate the quality and academic standards of its taught programmes and postgraduate research theses, in line with international best practice.

The University is also required to assure the quality of validated programmes delivered by its linked educational providers under the *Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI) Act 2012.*

2.   Purpose

The External Examiners Policy ensures a transparent, consistent and effective external examining system at Trinity.

3.   Benefits

3.1   The quality of the content, organisation and assessment of Trinity's programmes is maintained and enhanced.

3.2   The Trinity education is benchmarked to that of comparable universities.

3.3   The standard for research thesis examination is aligned with international best practice.

4.   Scope

4.1   This policy applies to the external examining of taught programmes at undergraduate and postgraduate level, and of postgraduate research dissertations.

4.2   The minimum requirement at Trinity is for external examining of the final year of degree awarding programmes. Additional requirements vary across schools and disciplines, and may be subject to the requirements of external accreditation bodies.

5.   Principles

5.1   Trinity is responsible for the quality assurance of its education, research and related services.

5.2   External examiners provide a valuable and objective perspective that contributes to the quality assurance of Trinity education and research programmes.

6.   Definitions

6.1   External Examiners are individuals appointed to provide impartial and independent advice on degree awarding standards and on student achievement in relation to those standards. They are drawn from academia and also from industry, business and the professions. For research dissertations the external examiner must be recognised as an independent expert in the candidate field of study.

7.   Policy

7.1   **Role of the External Examiner of Taught Programmes at Undergraduate and Postgraduate Level:**

   i.   Evaluate if academic standards are being maintained;

   ii.   Ensure that examination regulations are followed;

   iii. Ensure that individual students are treated fairly;

   iv.   Moderate on borderline cases in all classes of award;

   v.   Attend at least one meeting per academic year of the Courts of Examiners of which they are member;

   vi.   Identify and communicate areas for improvement at the Court of Examiners and document them in the External Examiner Annual Report;

   vii. Submit the External Examiner Annual Report within eight weeks of completion of external examining duties.

7.2   Role of the External Examiner of Postgraduate Research Theses, Masters and Doctoral:

i.   Determine if a thesis submitted for a Masters degree shows evidence of rigour and discrimination, appreciation of the relationship of the subject to a wider field of knowledge, and makes a contribution to knowledge/scholarship;

ii. Determine if a thesis submitted for a Doctoral degree shows evidence of rigour and discrimination, appreciation of the relationship of the subject to a wider field of knowledge, and makes an appreciable, original contribution to knowledge, as well as showing originality in the methods used and/or conclusions drawn;

iii. Propose that, in the case of a Master's degree:

  a. The degree be awarded for the thesis as it stands;

  b. The degree be awarded for the thesis subject to minor corrections, for which two months are allowed from the time of notification;

  c. The thesis be referred for major revision and subsequent re-examination, for which 6 months are normally allowed from the time of notification; or

  d. The thesis should be failed.

iv. Propose that, in the case of a Doctoral degree,

  a. The degree be awarded for the thesis as it stands,

  b. The degree be awarded for the thesis subject to minor corrections, for which two months are allowed from the time of notification,

  c. The thesis be referred for major revision and subsequent re-examination, for which six months are normally allowed from the time of notification,

  d. A lower degree be awarded, if necessary, following minor corrections to the thesis, or

  e. The thesis should be failed.

v. Viva Voce Examinations

    a. A viva voce is not mandatory in the examination of a Master's thesis. However, one may be arranged if either of the examiners, or the School's Director of Teaching and Learning (Postgraduate), requires it after preliminary consideration of the thesis;

    b. A viva voce examination is mandatory in cases where one or both examiners contemplate failure of the Master's thesis or recommend that the thesis is referred for major corrections;

    c. A viva must be held for all Ph.D. candidates.

vi. Inform the Dean of Graduate Studies that requested corrections have been carried out satisfactorily if nominated to do so in the case of two External Examiners being appointed, one of which has been assigned the functions of the internal examiner.

vii. Submit the report of the examination (including the viva voce if held) within eight weeks of the completion of examining duties.

7.3 **Criteria**

7.3.1 Taught Programmes

i. External examiners must possess sufficient seniority, experience and achievement in the discipline covered by the programme.

ii. External examiners should normally be attached to a third level institution and hold qualifications to at least the level of the qualification under assessment.

iii. External examiners should not have any existing or recent relationships with Trinity, members of its staff or students that could call their impartiality into question.

7.3.2 Research Thesis

i. The external examiner should be a recognised independent expert in the candidates field of study;

ii. The external examiner should not be a collaborator in the candidate's research;

iii. The external examiner should not be a recent graduate of Trinity, i.e. within the past ten years;

iv. External examiners should not have any existing or recent relationships with Trinity, members of its staff or students that could call their impartiality into question.

v. The Dean of Graduate Studies is to be consulted prior to approaching the nominee if they are not from a Third Level Educational Institution.

7.4 **Appointment**

7.4.1 Taught Programmes

i. The number of external examiners appointed to the degree year of each programme must be enough to ensure that sufficient expertise is available to cover all areas of the syllabus under assessment.

ii. Heads of School in consultation with Course Coordinators and Director of Teaching and Learning (Undergraduate) submit nominations to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies for approval on behalf of the University Council.

iii. Director of Teaching and Learning (Postgraduate) in consultation with Course Coordinators submit nominations to the Dean of Graduate Studies for approval on behalf of the University Council.

iv. Where it is necessary to create an additional external examiner position, then the Faculty Dean, as budget holder, must give approval to the creation of the position.

7.4.2 Research Thesis

i. The Director of Teaching and Learning (Postgraduate) in consultation with the supervisor nominates potential external examiners to the Dean of Graduate Studies.

ii. The Dean of Graduate Studies approves nominations for external examiner for Masters and Doctoral Research Thesis on behalf of the University Council.

iii. Where it is necessary to create an additional external examiner position, then the Dean of Graduate studies must give approval to the creation of the position.

7.5   Term of Appointment

i. The term of appointment for external examiners for taught programmes is three academic years.

ii. Extensions for an additional year for taught programmes may only be sought under exceptional circumstances and require approval from the Dean of Undergraduate Studies or Dean of Graduate Studies.

iii. Examiners in taught programmes may not be re-appointed unless at least six years have elapsed since the end of their previous appointment.

iv. The term of appointment for external examiners of research dissertations is to the point of completion of the process, which may be up to two years if work is referred for major corrections.

v. Examiners of research dissertations may not be appointed until at least five years have elapsed since the end of their previous appointment.

vi. An external examiner may be discharged from their appointment at any time during their term, if they fail to adequately perform their roles and responsibilities, as outlined in this policy or if conflicts of interest arise during their term.

7.6   Payment

i. Trinity pays external examiners of taught programmes fees at a fixed rate and also reimburses expenses incurred.

ii. Trinity pays external examiners of research thesis a fixed fee per individual examination and also reimburses expenses incurred.

iii. Payment is administered by Heads of School and School Administrators.

iv. External examiners must complete the required payment forms in order to facilitate payment.

v.   Payment for research Masters and Doctoral theses examination is administered through the Office of Graduate Studies.

7.7   External Examining of Validated Programmes Delivered by Linked Providers

7.7.1   Linked providers are expected to abide by the terms of this policy and are accountable to Trinity for the quality assurance of programmes validated by the University.

7.7.2   Linked providers must submit nominations for the external examiners of validated programmes to the Trinity College Registrar, for approval by the Associated Colleges Degree Committee, or equivalent management committee.

7.7.3   Linked providers meet all the costs associated with the external examining of validated programmes.

7.8   External Examining of Programmes Delivered by Collaborative Partners

7.8.1   Collaborative partners must establish their own arrangements for the external examining of collaborative programmes, in alignment with this policy and in accordance with relevant quality assurance legislation in their respective jurisdictions.

8.   Responsibility

8.1   The Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies is responsible for overseeing this policy in relation to postgraduate taught and research programmes.

8.2   The Office of the Dean of Undergradaute Studies is responsible for overseeing this policy in relation to undergraduate programmes.

9.   Related Documents

9.1   External Examining Process Maps (Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught)

9.2   External Examiner nomination form (Taught Programmes)

9.3   Nomination Form for External and Internal Examiners of Research Theses

9.4   Graduate Studies Office – Research Examiners Nomination Guidelines

9.4   External Examiner Annual Report Template (Taught Programmes)

9.5   External Examiner payment forms (registered for tax in the Republic of Ireland):

      External Examiners/Reviewers Irish Set-up Form

      PRD10 form

      EE Payment Requisition Form.

9.6   External Examiner payment forms (not registered for tax in the Republic of Ireland, and responsible for complying with tax regulations in accordance with the requirements of their country of origin):

      EE Payment Requisition Form.

10.   Document Control

10.1   Approved by Quality Committee on x/x/2015   Next review due x/x/2017

EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT GUIDANCE

Trinity College Dublin, the University of Dublin values External Examiners and the contribution they make to the quality assurance of teaching and learning, the maintenance of academic standards and the benchmarking of Trinity programmes of education and research against those of other universities in Ireland and internationally.

The quality assurance of teaching and learning is a requirement under the Quality & Qualifications Act 2012 and the Standard and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG).

External Examiners are asked to complete the External Examiner Annual Reports with their following use in mind:

  i.   they will be used by programmes and schools to inform internal quality assurance activities;
  ii.   they are provided in documentation to External Reviewers conducting quality reviews of programmes and schools;
  iii. they and the External Examining process itself form part of the demonstration of institutional quality assurance and enhancement to external stakeholders such as Quality & Qualifications Ireland and the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)

Trinity requests the cooperation of external examiners by asking that:

  i.   all sections, as appropriate, of the report template are completed and returned within eight weeks of completion of duties for the external examining period.
  ii.   any recommendations for improvement at programme, course or module level discussed and agreed at the Courts of Examiners are documented in the annual report.

Undergraduate External Examiner Reports are to be submitted to the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies /Senior Lecturer mailbox at Senior.Lecturer@tcd.ie

Postgraduate Taught and Research External Examiner Reports are to be submitted to the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies mailbox at deanssec@tcd.ie

Any feedback on the template can be forwarded to the Quality Officer at Quality.Officer@tcd.ie

External Examiner electronic signature…………………………………………………………………….

Date of submission……………………………………..

Trinity College Dublin
Coláiste na Tríonóide, Baile Átha Cliath
The University of Dublin

EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT TAUGHT PROGRAMMES

Name of External Examiner:………………………………………………………………………………………………

Name of Home University/Institution:…………………………………………………………………………………

Year Appointed: 201x   Year of current term is: Yr. 1 □; Yr. 2 □; Yr. 3 □;   Extended Yr. 4 □.

Programme/Course/ Strand Title:

……….

Module or Subject Title/Code:

……………………………………………………………………………………………………….

Section A: External Examiner Arrangements

A1: Did you receive all the necessary information on the aims, objectives and structure of the programme/course?
[*These would generally be provided in the Course or Programme Handbook and include module descriptors and learning outcomes; marking schemes and examination conventions; criteria for the award of Gold Medals (UG only)*]]

Yes □   No □

A2.1: Where written examinations form a component of the assessment, did you receive the draft examination papers?

Yes □   No □   Not applicable □

A2.2: Where you made recommendations on draft examination papers, were these acted upon?

Yes □   No □   Not applicable □

A3: Did you have access to all scripts and assessment work that you wished to see?

Yes □   No □

A4: Where the conduct or moderation of oral examinations, performances/recitals forms part of the programme/course or module you were examining, were suitable arrangements made to facilitate your attendance?

Yes □   No □   Not applicable □

A5: Was the Court of Examiners' meeting conducted to your satisfaction?

Yes □   No □ if no, please comment

Comment:

A6: Did you seek the opportunity to speak to students or to review feedback provided by students on the programme/ course/module that you are examining?

Yes □   No □

Section A: Additional comments on External Examiner Arrangements *(optional)*

Section B: Curriculum Design, Assessment, Standards

B1: Your comment is sought on the **curriculum design and content** including strengths, weaknesses and/or opportunities for further development/ improvement.
 [*Coherence and content of the curriculum as compared to similar programmes/courses elsewhere; extent to which programme/module learning outcomes addressed skills and competencies as well as knowledge]*

……

……

……

……

……

B2: Your comment is sought on the **assessment tools** used and may include strengths, weaknesses and/or opportunities for further development/ improvement.
[*Standard and scope of questions/problems set in examination papers and formative assessment; appropriateness of assessment methodology to achievement of learning outcomes, balance of formative and summative assessment*]

…….

……

……..

……

…….

B3: Your comment is sought on the **quality and standard of marking and feedback** and may include strengths, weaknesses and/or opportunities for further development/ improvement.
[*Standard and appropriateness of marking criteria used; consistency of marking; clarity and transparency of the marking scheme and internal examiners' comments; quality of feedback to students*]

……

……

……

……

……

B4: Your comment is sought on the **assessment of dissertations/projects** and may include strengths, weaknesses and/or opportunities for further development/ improvement.
[*Appropriateness of choice of subjects; marking scheme and criteria; quality of submitted work; appropriateness of the assessment methodology*].

……

……..

……

……..

……

B5: Your comment is sought on the **standards of the programme/course/ module and performance of students** and may include strengths, weaknesses and/or opportunities for further development/ improvement.
[*Academic standards and achievements of students i.e. (i) quality of candidates, pass rates; (ii) compared to other higher education institutions, of which you have had experience; (iii) If applicable, compared with previous years*].

……

……..

……

……..

……

B6: Your comment is sought on any other specific aspect of the programme/course/module(s) that you wish to highlight as an example of good practice or that you would like to see disseminated more widely.

……..

……..

……

……..

Section B. Additional comments on Curriculum Design, Assessment and Standards *(optional)*

Section C: Feedback/Quality Assurance

C1: Your feedback is sought on whether your recommendations from previous years have been implemented and if you received communication that they have been addressed.

……

……..

……

……

C2: If applicable, please provide feedback on the resourcing of the programme/course /modules.

……

……

……..

……..

Section D: Collaborative or Transnational Provision (if applicable)

D1: If collaborative and transnational arrangements are applicable to the programme/course/module you are examining, please comment on the **assessment and the achievement** of students in different sites.

……

……

……..

Section E: Final Report *(for year 3 (final year) or year 4 (extended year) of External Examiner Term)*

E1: You are invited to provide your overall observations on the programme/course/module(s) you have examined in this term of appointment.

……

……

……

……

……

……..

……

……..

……

E2: Additional Comments on your experience as an External Examiner in Trinity College:

……

……

……..

……

……..

……….

……