<div style="border:1px solid">

SUBJECT EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT
ACADEMIC SESSION   2014/2015

</div>

Manchester Metropolitan University

**NB: This report template is for completion by <u>Subject External Examiners</u> (Tier One)
including <u>all</u> External Examiners operating at programmes offered by our Collaborative Partners.
<u>Examiners appointed to programmes that have been permitted to operate in a single-tier Assessment
Board structure should also complete this template.</u>**

Award External Examiners (Tier Two) should complete template EE4A.

SECTION A: NOTES FOR GUIDANCE ON COMPLETING THIS FORM
1   **Please use this form for submitting, electronically, your annual External Examiner's Report. <u>The report will be available to staff and students and receive wide circulation within the Institution as part of our Continuous Monitoring and Improvement process. It will also be available more widely on request, so we ask that you do not refer to staff or students by name</u>. Where staff or students are referred to by name, the report will be redacted to remove these details. The report, when submitted, will become the property of the University and will be subject to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998 and the Freedom of Information Act as applicable.**
2   **Sections B, D, E, F, J, K and M are for completion by all External Examiners. Other Sections should be completed where appropriate.**
3   **Once completed, the form should be submitted electronically to the appropriate Head of Faculty Student and Academic Services at the email address given at the end of this template.**
4   **Your Report should be submitted to the University within six weeks of the date of the final Assessment Board meeting which dealt with cohort(s) of students to which the report refers. Programme Teams are required to respond to External Examiners concerning issues raised in the report. This response will be completed as Section N within this report, which will be returned to you following consideration at the next scheduled Programme Committee meeting.** **<u>In completing your report, please use language that is readily understood by all readers</u>.** **Thank you for your continued support and contribution to the University's quality assurance and enhancement procedures.**

SECTION B:		
1	**External Examiner Name**:	Jean Metcalfe
2	**Assessment Board(s) of which a member**:	**Collaborative Partner Colleges Board**
3	**Programme(s) for which the examiner has been approved:**	**Foundation Degrees**
4	**Specialist/subject area(s) examined:**	Event Management, Spa Management Travel and Tourism Management
5	**Department/School:**	Food and Tourism Management
6	**Faculty/Division:**	Hollings
7	**Collaborative provision: (please supply names of all partners and details of provision)**	Macclesfield College (FdA Event Management) Mid Cheshire College (FdA Travel and Tourism Management)

		The Manchester College (FdA Event Management and FdA Travel and Tourism Management) Trafford College (FdA Spa Management)

SECTION C: INDUCTION AND BRIEFING
(To be completed <u>only if this is your first report and you are commencing your period of appointment as an External Examiner at MMU</u>)

C1	Can you confirm that:	YES	NO
before taking on the role of External Examiner, you were sufficiently briefed on the nature of your responsibilities, including the units to which you were appointed to examine?		Yes	
you have been provided with detail on where to receive guidance on your role as External Examiner at MMU?		Yes	
you have been offered the opportunity to meet the programme team/faculty staff where you have requested this?		Yes	
you have received the programme specification and relevant unit proformas from the Programme Leader?		Yes	

C2	Do you find:	YES	NO
the External Examiners' website (http://www.mmu.ac.uk/academic/casqe/examiners/) to be clear and helpful?		Yes	
the External Examiners' Handbook a useful briefing tool?		Yes	
the MMU *Institutional Code of Practice and Regulations on External Examining* on the role and responsibilities of External Examiners to be clear and appropriate?		Yes	

C3	What comments or recommendations do you have on the preparation process that we provide for new External Examiners?

SECTION D: ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS
Please do not mention staff or students by name as your report will be made available to students and other stakeholders

		YES	NO
D1	Were you given access to the following? (Please make specific comment in D2 if you have answered NO to any of the questions below. If the question is not applicable to you, please indicate by N/A in the YES column)	YES	NO
	Information on the dates and arrangements for Assessment Board(s) to which you were invited;	Yes	
	Programme handbooks and programme specifications for each set of units you are responsible for externally examining;		No
	Unit proformas for all units you are responsible for externally examining;	Yes	
	Draft examination papers;		No
	Assessment briefs and marking criteria;	Yes	
	<u>Where appropriate</u>, details of arrangements made for you to conduct orals and/or moderate performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements?	N/A	
	Sufficient information for you to carry out your duties and responsibilities;	Yes	
	University (and, where relevant, unit-specific and programme-specific) assessment regulations.	Yes	
D2	What comments do you have which could improve the communication with External Examiners? (Please make specific comment here if you have answered NO to any of the questions in D1.)		

I was sent the Programme Specifications when I requested these but did not view any Programme Handbooks this year. However, the Programme Specifications sent to me and the unit handbooks, which were included in the unit boxes for review prior to the Exam Board, provided sufficient information to enable me to gain a detailed picture of the different programmes.

I was not sent draft examination papers this year and now understand that this was recommended by my predecessor. As this was my first year as External Examiner and there were also some staffing changes at MMU, I can see how this aspect might have been overlooked. I can confirm that I would like these to be sent to me in future.

D3	Have responses, by the Programme Team, Department or Faculty, to issues raised in your previous reports been appropriately addressed, and to your satisfaction? (If this is your first report, please indicate by N/A in the YES column)	YES	NO
		N/A	
If you have answered NO, please provide further details.			
D4	Are there any other administrative or procedural matters that you would wish to draw to the attention of the University?	YES	NO
		Yes	
If you have answered YES, please provide details. It would be helpful perhaps to clarify, in the Guidance for External Examiners, which report (Subject or Award) should be completed for the Collaborative Partner Colleges Board as this Board would appear to be a combination of the two, where students' progression is presented and final awards are also agreed. I sought guidance on this from members of the Faculty team, who confirmed that it should be the Subject Board Report. The top of this report form also confirms this so the confusion may have been due to some unfamiliar terms and because the Guidance is general for all EEs.			

SECTION E: ASSESSMENT PROCESSES
Please do not mention staff or students by name as your report will be made available to students and other stakeholders

E1	Assessment - Can you confirm that: (Please make specific comment in E4 if you have answered NO to any of the questions below.)	YES	NO
the curriculum on each unit you have examined remains current?		Yes	
the curriculum on each unit you have examined remains coherent?		Yes	
units at the same level within a single programme are set at a comparable standard?		Yes	
the MMU procedures for the verification, marking and moderation of assessments (available on the External Examiners' Website at: http://www.mmu.ac.uk/academic/casqe/regulations/docs/verification_marking_moderation.pdf) provides you with a sufficient sample of scripts for each unit you are responsible for externally examining?		Yes	
MMU is maintaining the threshold academic standards for its units and levels of study in accordance with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications and applicable Subject Benchmark statements?		Yes	
the types of assessment are appropriate for the subject, the students, the respective level of study and the expected learning outcomes?		Yes	
the assessment process measures student achievement rigorously and fairly against the intended outcomes of the unit and stage of the programme(s) and is conducted in line with the institution's policies and regulations (or those of the PSRB where exemption/variation from MMU Regulations has been granted)?		Yes	
the method of internal marking at unit level is fair and reliable and of an appropriate standard, and that the marking scheme has been properly and consistently applied?		Yes	
the scripts were marked in such a way, and where appropriate comments added, to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?		Yes	
you have been made aware of procedures governing: exceptional factors, academic integrity (professional suitability and misconduct), and borderline performances in relation to the units that you have examined?		Yes	
arrangements were made to consider your comments?		Yes	

E2	Dissertation/Project *[for completion only if you have considered dissertation/project-related work]* Can you confirm that: (Please make specific comment in Q: E4 if you have answered NO to any of the questions below.)	YES	NO
the choice of subjects for dissertations is appropriate?		N/A	
the method and standard of assessment and internal moderation is appropriate?		N/A	
E3	Assessment Board - Can you confirm: (Please make specific comment in Q: E4 if you have answered NO to any of the questions below)	YES	NO
that you are satisfied with the conduct of the Assessment Board?		Yes	
that you are satisfied with the recommendations of the Assessment Board?		Yes	
the comparability of University assessment processes with other HEIs with which you are familiar?		Yes	
that you were able to attend all scheduled meetings of the Assessment Board(s)		Yes	
that if you were unable to attend any meetings of the Assessment Board(s), you have been involved in the assessment process? (If this question is not applicable, please leave both columns blank)			
E4	What matters do you wish to bring to the Programme Team or University's attention in relation to assessment processes? (Please make specific comment here if you have answered NO to any of the questions in E1 – E3 inclusive.)		
E5	Do you wish to raise any matters in relation to the University's Assessment Regulations that should be considered by the University Registrar?		
No			

SECTION F: STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Please do not mention staff or students by name as your report will be made available to students and other stakeholders

F1	Please comment on what you infer about the quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods as indicated by marks distribution at unit level.

From the samples viewed, across all programmes, I can see that tutors work hard to encourage and support learners from a range of backgrounds and with varying skill levels. Although I have not personally observed the teaching and learning approaches, it is clear from the documentation and the evident progress of students that successful strategies are being employed. The inclusion of visits and guest speakers also helps to ensure that the programmes are contemporary and vocationally relevant. The different assessment methods used provide opportunities for all to succeed and the assignment tasks are appropriate for the subject areas and levels. The assessment word count in the "Cruise Operations" module appears to be unduly heavy for the level and size of the module so I suggest this is checked and reviewed by the Link Tutor with the relevant Programme teams. Although the programmes and cohorts are different, I would like to see a more consistent approach to examination format and would recommend that this is an aspect for review by the Link Tutor and Programme Leaders. The distribution of marks can be limited on some programmes but this may be explained by the relatively small cohorts. The use of a marking grid with clear grade boundary descriptors is essential and helpful but I would still encourage tutors to be more confident in using the full range of marks available, where appropriate. It is also important to ensure the marks awarded always reflect the feedback comments e.g. if it is an excellent piece of work then grade it appropriately, if it is a very poor assignment then this could be graded lower than just a marginal fail.

F2	Please comment on the overall academic standards and students achievements in relation to their peers in other UK Higher Education Institutions with which you are familiar.

I believe the overall academic standards and student achievements compare appropriately with those on similar programmes in other UK HEIs with which I am familiar. Some of the group and individual project work is of a good standard, providing evidence of relevant vocational and academic skill development and comparing favourably with the work of students on other similar programmes. The levels of analysis and reflection could still be enhanced across all programmes.

F3	Please comment on whether the standards of the units for which you have responsibility are appropriate for the qualification in this subject and address relevant Subject Benchmark statements?

The standards of the units, as presented in the unit handbooks provided, are appropriate for the qualification, are designed to meet the Programme Learning Outcomes and address both the QAA 2010 Foundation Degree Subject Benchmark Statements and the QAA Subject Benchmark Statements for Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism 2008. Some additional, unit specific points are made within the review of collaborative provision in section G.

F4	Where the programme has any approved work-based learning, professional practice or placement element, please comment on student performance and achievement of

	intended learning outcomes.
N/A	

SECTION G: COLLABORATIVE PROVISION
(Only to be completed by examiners with a responsibility for collaborative provision)

Please do not mention staff or students by name as your report will be made available to students and other stakeholders

G1	Please comment specifically on student achievement of programmes delivered by MMU Collaborative Partners. Where there is more than one provider, if your comments relate to one specific institution (including MMU) please specify to which provider your comments refer.

I looked through a number of units and sample student assignments from across the provision during my visit to MMU. The following comments refer to the selection that I examined more closely, especially units common to different programmes so that comparisons might be made.

Macclesfield College (Foundation Degree Event Management, Year 2)

Work Based Unit 2

Clear Unit Handbook and Assignments were provided with evidence of thorough IV processes. Some student evaluations of the unit were included but there was no Unit Leaders Report, which would have been helpful. The assignments included had been effectively marked and internally moderated. The tutor has given clear feedback on the work, highlighting areas for improvement. The portfolios (PDP) were comprehensive and very well presented including good levels of reflection and analysis. Good practice is very evident here and this could be shared with other Colleges. This might also enhance consistency in marking levels across the Programmes. The spread of marks is quite narrow, reflecting the small cohort.

Human Resource Management

No Unit Leaders Report was provided in the sample but the assignment and exam paper were included. I liked the provision of a "student feedback on their own performance" box, which is part of the submission front sheet – perhaps this might also be used by students after they receive their marks? The Case Study for assignment 1 is appropriate and seems to have worked well with some effectively researched and well presented work submitted. Both the assignment and exam paper have been internally verified and moderated with detailed feedback on the work and clear indication of where marks have been awarded. I suggest future draft exam papers and indicative answers are sent to the Link Tutor and External Examiner to check there is consistency in approach (numbers of questions/ format of exam) across the partner provision and that all questions are at the appropriate level (e.g. avoid asking students to merely "describe" at level 5).

Project Management

It was very helpful to read a summary/ reflection on the Unit by the tutor but no overall results spreadsheet was included in the Unit Box. The project portfolios were good, showing the detailed event planning, operations and promotional skills developed by students during their studies (some very good practice here). The tutor has graded the work appropriately and provided clear feedback, highlighting areas for improvement e.g. suggesting the use of Gantt Charts (which I would also have expected to see).

The Manchester College (Foundation Degree in Travel and Tourism Management)

Work Based Unit 1

There appeared to be no assessment outline included in the sample, but a grid marking scheme was included for each section with a space for additional comments. The marks seemed to be a little on the high side with only limited standard deviation and I therefore recommend that there is a future discussion about what is expected at this level. Although there is evidence of some useful analysis and reflection, this aspect was rather limited and the CVs all needed further refinement.

Work Based Unit 2 (Year 2)

The Research Reports were interesting and showed evidence of effective research. Feedback was detailed and the marking robust for this element. The PDP (Assessment 2) portfolios included some good personal reflections on their experiences and motivations but the CVs were still quite weak. The marking of the portfolios seemed a little generous when judged against the feedback comments and when compared with other provision, so this does warrant future review.

Business Tourism (Year 2)

It was good to see a Unit Report which provides some analysis and evaluation of the module as this can feed directly into the quality management process at Programme level. The tutor provided very detailed assignment feedback, identifying areas for improvement on the work submitted. The portfolio of evidence for the group project, based around a Business Event, showed some very creative ideas and illustrated the development of a range of highly transferable skills.

The Manchester College (Foundation Degree in Event Management)

Event Operations and Logistics (Year 1)

A clear unit handbook was provided but the statistics referred to in the unit report did not seem to correspond with those on the unit results spreadsheet, so this was a little confusing. Good evidence of thorough internal moderation of assignment marking, highlighting that feedback might have been more detailed. The final portfolios were very well presented and included some great promotional ideas and detailed risk assessments. These show that the students are gaining vital skills in events operational planning and management.

Project Management (Year 2)

Evidence here of some students really embracing the opportunity to manage their own projects and there were some very good reflections and evaluations of their experiences. The Gantt Charts were very good, showing effective skill development and providing evidence that students have the skills to progress successfully into careers in events or into further study. The aspect that might have been enhanced further would have been that relating to Risk Management (e.g. Risk

Registers/ Emergency Preparedness Plans to supplement the standard risk assessments).

Human Resource Management (Year 2)

No unit handbook was included in the unit box but the assignment and exam paper were supplied. There was a clear unit report but it would be useful to see a little more analysis rather than a brief, descriptive approach as it could feed more effectively into the quality management processes and Course Improvement Plans. Detailed and helpful feedback was given on the assignments and there is good evidence of effective internal verification. I would recommend avoiding awarding a mark of 39% for a failed piece. The exam had been marked appropriately, and internally moderated so the grades were appropriately awarded. However, as with the other Colleges, I suggest future draft exam papers and indicative answers are sent to the Link Tutor and External Examiner to check for consistency across the collaborative provision (numbers of questions/ format of exam/ front covers of answer books etc.).

Mid Cheshire College (Foundation Degree in Travel and Tourism)

Tourism Destinations and Global Sustainability

Both the assignment and the exam seemed to be rather challenging for level four students but they appear to have tackled these quite well, showing evidence of appropriate reading and of developing academic writing skills. Some good answers were also given in the exam paper. The tutor had obviously covered a lot of ground in the module and the feedback on the assignment was thorough and constructive. The average marks for the module seemed rather low and it would be helpful for the tutor to reflect on this aspect and on the level of the module when writing the unit report. This can feed into quality management processes and would be helpful for revalidations.

Work Based Unit 2 (Year 2) Research Project

Clear unit handbooks, assignments and Internal Verification evidence were provided. Some of the Research Projects included were quite weak and were graded accordingly. Equally there were some good examples, showing effective research and analytical skills. The feedback might have been a little more detailed in relation to how some students might improve the work.

Human Resource Management (Year 2)

I really liked the inclusion of a Performance Appraisal, involving students playing different roles. This is good practice, is engaging for students and helps to develop transferable skills. It was not immediately clear if this formed part of the marked assessment or was an in class activity as it is not referred to specifically in the assessment strategy for the unit. The case study assignment showed that students had gained a good level of knowledge and understanding of key concepts and could analyse effectively using appropriate research. The examination covered a wide range of topics using a multiple question and short answer format. This had been internally verified and marked at the correct level but I suggest future draft exam papers are sent to the Link Tutor and External Examiner to check for consistency, clarity and format.

The Cruise Sector (Year 2)

As this is a level five unit, worth 30 credits, I was rather surprised to see the extent of assessment. This seemed onerous, including a 4000 word essay and a 5000 word case study report. Please check this aspect with the validated documents and the Link Tutor. Students who took the module

clearly worked hard to meet the standard, with some providing very well researched and analytical reports, showing the tutor is preparing them effectively for further study. The assignment feedback comments and the grades awarded did not always match up so beware of this aspect e.g. "Excellent knowledge... thorough and critical analysis...evidence of wider reading" suggests a much higher mark than 59%. Try to use the full range of marks or revise comments so that these are a more accurate reflection of the work and/or grade. No unit report was supplied.

Trafford College (Foundation Degree in Spa Management)

Business Enterprise

The unit handbook is comprehensive but the unit report did not include any meaningful analysis of the statistics. This would have been useful as the marks for the first assignment seem very high and there were some non submissions for assignment 2. The assignment feedback is detailed but on some examples the comments could provide more suggestions on areas for improvement e.g. validity and relevance of sources. The work has been clearly internally verified and moderated.

Spa Facilities Management

The unit report includes some commentary on the statistics, revealing that the wide range of marks was due to a significant number of withdrawals on the programme. The assignment tasks are interesting and entirely relevant for the programme. Some of the presentations included were good and the feedback was detailed on these but there did not appear to be any comments actually on the other work for the module. There appeared to be different styles of assignment feedback forms across one programme which was a little confusing.

Work Based Study

The Research Project example showed evidence of good research skills and the tutor has given very detailed feedback on the work, highlighting clearly where aspects might be enhanced. Some of the PDP portfolios, in contrast, seemed rather disorganised and lacking in reflection and analysis. I would advise that the approach to PDP, expected standards and examples of good practice, might be the focus of discussion at a future collaborative provision workshop. No unit report or analysis but there is evidence of Internal verification and moderation.

Management of Healthy Development

Although there was no unit report and the overall result spreadsheet was missing, the student assignments made interesting reading and were very relevant for the programme. The assignments are suitably challenging and the submitted work had been appropriately graded with evidence of detailed marking and internal verification.

G2	For programmes operating at more than one site, please comment on the comparability of delivery between the sites.

As this is my first year as External Examiner, I have not yet had the opportunity to visit the different Partner Institutions to comment fully on this aspect but it is clear that there is collaboration, information and resources sharing across the network and through the Link Tutor. I recommend that the newly appointed Link Tutor and Programme Leaders meet to review the approach to examinations (style/ format) and to Personal Development Portfolios (Work Based

Unit) to enhance consistency and share best practice.

SECTION H: PROFESSIONAL, STATUTORY, REGULATORY BODY REQUIREMENTS
(Only to be completed by those External Examiners responsible for PSRB related units of study)

Please do not mention staff or students by name as your report will be made available to students and other stakeholders

H1	Please comment specifically on how the programme reflects any PSRB requirements, commenting specifically on relevant professional issues such as fitness to practice, and any feature that relates to the specific discipline.

N/A

Please note that there is no SECTION I

SECTION J: GOOD PRACTICE AND ENHANCEMENT
Please do not mention staff or students by name as your report will be made available to students and other stakeholders

J1	Please note particular elements of good practice and innovation that you have identified relating to learning, teaching and assessment.

The inclusion of guest speakers, visits and invitations to attend key MMU lectures/ events provides variety, ensures vocational relevance of the programmes and encourages student aspirations.

The supportive approach of the MMU team and dedicated Link tutor, especially the provision of staff development opportunities and meetings where resources and best practice can be shared.

Evidence of thorough Internal Verification Systems in all the Colleges to continuously monitor and further enhance the quality of teaching, learning and assessment.

The Project Management module is highly relevant and provides great opportunities for students to demonstrate their expertise, to develop key vocational skills and enhance their employability.

The Business Tourism module is current and valid with an assessment approach that has been well considered and effectively managed. The group work and portfolio of evidence has clearly encouraged students' creativity, enhanced communication skills and allowed them to take ownership and responsibility for their own project.

Interesting, vocationally relevant and contemporary assignments across all programmes. The inclusion of a Performance Appraisal activity within HRM at Mid Cheshire was quite innovative.

The PDP (Portfolios) from Macclesfield College were detailed and very well presented.

It is clear from the detailed marking and constructive feedback given by all tutors that they know their students well and that they adopt an encouraging, supportive and motivational approach to

provide the best opportunities for achievement.

| J2 | Please note opportunities to enhance the quality of the learning opportunities provided to students and provide suggestions for improvements based on your experience at other institutions. |

I suggest that the approach to the Work Based Unit, in particular the PDP portfolio, might be the subject for discussion and review at a future collaborative meeting. Sharing ideas, and possibly even cross marking samples, would allow for best practice to be highlighted and this should ensure that grades across the Colleges are more in line on this aspect. Developing effective CVs and approaches to personal reflections might also be a focus for a future workshop and would be helpful in enhancing the quality of provision.

Continue to encourage a greater level of analysis by providing key topics for in class debates, or on line forum discussions, and by increasing the opportunities for students to review academic articles and related business case studies.

Consider adopting a more analytical and evaluative approach when writing unit reports as these feed directly into the quality management systems and provide an opportunity for reflection and continuous improvement, supporting minor amendment proposals and revalidations.

| J3 | Please comment on amendments/enhancements made to provision, assessment or administrative arrangements following comments you have previously made? |

N/A (first year).

| **SECTION K: PROGRAMME/SUBJECT OVERVIEW** |
| *Please do not mention staff or students by name as your report will be made available to students and other stakeholders* |

| K1 | Based on your involvement with the programme throughout the academic session, please provide an overview of the programme or subject including, for example, comment on the coherence of stage or programme assessment strategies or any other matters that you would wish to raise. |

I advise that future draft exam papers and model answers are not only internally moderated but also sent in advance to the Link Tutor and External Examiner so that any potential anomalies can be highlighted and to ensure consistency and clarity. It might be helpful to use a standard exam front cover and to provide guidance to tutors on format e.g. agreed time and number of questions, layout and instructions to candidates e.g. where/ how marks will be awarded etc.

Check unit assessment word count in some modules (e.g. The Cruise Sector) to ensure parity.

Review the breadth of content and level of the Tourism Destinations and Global Sustainability unit as the extent of topics covered by some tutors, and the reading required for the related assessments, suggest the unit may be viewed as higher than level four.

As noted in J2 above, review approaches to PDP and the portfolio assessment aspect to share best practice and ensure consistency.

K2	Where the programme has any approved work-based learning, professional practice or placement element, please comment on the organisation and delivery of such activities within the curriculum.

See earlier comments in sections G1 and J2 related to the Work Based Unit and PDP.

Although I have not yet had the opportunity to examine this aspect in depth, from the evidence provided within the WBU documentation it is clear that the individual Colleges have their own independent but robust systems in place to organise and deliver the work-based learning elements. Again, some best practice might be identified and shared here in future collaborative programme meetings.

SECTION L: FINAL REPORT
(To be completed only if this is your final report and you are completing your period of appointment as External Examiner)

L1	Please provide a summary of the way you have noted the Assessment Boards developing during the period of your appointment. Please report on whether consistency of standards and student achievement has been maintained across cohorts during your period of appointment. Please provide any recommendations you may have for their future development. Please also report on your overall experience as an External Examiner at MMU.

SECTION M: SUMMARY OF ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE PROGRAMME TEAM
Please do not mention staff or students by name as your report will be made available to students and other stakeholders

M1	Programme teams are responsible for providing External Examiners with a written response to their External Examiner Report. What particular issues would you specifically wish to see addressed in this response? This Section should include details of all issues to be addressed, including those raised earlier in the report. Issues to be addressed as a priority should be identified as such within this Section.

Priority actions

I advise that future draft exam papers and model answers are not only internally moderated but also sent in advance to the Link Tutor and External Examiner so that any potential anomalies can be highlighted and to ensure consistency and clarity. It might be helpful to use a standard exam front cover and to provide guidance to tutors on format e.g. agreed time and number of questions, layout and instructions to candidates e.g. where/ how marks will be awarded etc.

Check unit assessment word count in some units (e.g. The Cruise Sector) to ensure parity.

Recommendations

As noted in J2 above, review approaches to PDP and the portfolio assessment aspect to share best practice and ensure consistency.

Review the breadth of content and assessment level of the Tourism Destinations and Global Sustainability unit through discussion with the unit tutors involved.

Adopt a more analytical and reflective approach to the Unit Reports to provide greater insight for quality management, continuous improvement planning and future modifications/validations.

It would be really helpful to ensure the unit boxes, provided for external review, are checked carefully and contain all relevant documentation in a consistent, logical and clearly labelled order e.g. Unit Report (including statistical analysis/ standard deviation etc.); Unit Results Spreadsheet; Unit Handbook and Assessments; Internal (and/or external) Verification/ Moderation evidence; sample marked assignments across the range.

SECTION N: RESPONSE BY PROGRAMME TEAM TO EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT
(to be completed by the Programme Leader following consideration of the report at the next scheduled Programme Committee meeting.)

Please provide a detailed response to all issues raised within the report

SECTION O:
(For office use only immediately upon receipt of report)

Date report received:	**13/07/2015**
Date report acknowledged:	**13/07/2015**
Date forwarded to CASQE, Programme Leader(s), Dean(s),	15/07/2015

Head(s), Programme(s) Officer(s):	
Date forwarded to Partner Organisation(s) (if applicable):	15/07/2015 29/10/2015
Date formal response (Section N) sent to External Examiner:	

SUBMISSION DETAILS

(*Please submit your report to the appropriate email address below*)

Manchester School of Art	Mr V Fitzpatrick	artdes-eereports@mmu.ac.uk
Faculty of Humanities, Languages and Social Science	Mr V Fitzpatrick	hlss.eereports@mmu.ac.uk
Hollings Faculty	Mrs M Austin	hollings.eereports@mmu.ac.uk
Faculty of Science and Engineering	Mrs M Austin	se.eereports@mmu.ac.uk
Faculty of Health, Psychology and Social Care	Ms S Sharpe	hpsc.eereports@mmu.ac.uk
Faculty of Education	Ms S Sharpe	education.eereports@mmu.ac.uk
Faculty of Business and Law	Mr N Legge	buslaw.eereports@mmu.ac.uk
MMU Cheshire	Mrs H Legge	crw.eereport@mmu.ac.uk