

## **Role of External Examiner for UG programmes in School of Psychology**

External examiners are involved in the examination process for Sophister level students only. One external examiner considers the SS year, a second external examiner considers the JS year (along with Years 1 and 2 of the Psychology Conversion Course).

Prior to visit to university:

1. Review examination questions/papers, prior to exam period.
2. Review a representative sample of graded Final Year Dissertations (SS)
  - a. Projects representative of each class/grade are sent in advance to examiners (along with feedback sheets from first and second markers) – typically external examiners are given about 20-25% of projects.
  - b. Where discrepancies exist in marks between first, second (and occasionally third) markers, the external examiner is asked to review those marks and make a recommendation
3. Review Group Projects (JS)
  - a. All graded group projects are sent to the external examiner for consideration.

During visit to university for exam board meeting:

1. Review course work and examination scripts for each JS and SS module (except projects, referenced above). This enables examiners to note whether marks are awarded consistently across modules and whether marks are appropriate given the standard of work. [A sample of scripts for each exam is moderated by faculty within the school, prior to the exam board meeting].
2. Review completed spreadsheets, detailing each student's mark for each module to enable inconsistencies across modules and students to be detected and investigated.
3. Comment on the overall quality of the students' work, the examination and assessment process, and on the quality of the course/standard of students in general.
4. Prepare and submit a report to the university in which the following issues are usually addressed: their perception of the actual attainment of students, perspectives on the quality of the programme (e.g. breadth of material covered; content of modules); quality of the assessments and the grading schemes applied; views on the fairness and consistency with which grading schemes were applied; and generally how the programme compares with other programmes with which they are familiar. They also report on strengths and weaknesses of the programme and recommendations about the programme to the University.

**Elizabeth Nixon,  
DUTL  
16/12/16**