

Part 1 - Summary of External/Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report

Please note that this part of your report will be made available to the public.

University of London External System			
Award (s) partially or wholly covered by this summary (eg BSc Economics)		MSc Epidemiology by Distance Learning	
Subject Area or Modules (if applicable)		Epidemiology	
Academic year examined (eg 2008-09) or Calendar year examined (eg 2009)		2008-9	Exam Month (eg May, June, October)
Home institution and/or professional affiliation of the External/Intercollegiate Examiner		University of York	
In the view of the External/Intercollegiate Examiner, the standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level, in this subject. <i>(please tick)</i>			Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
If no, in what respects do they fall short? <i>(Max 300 words please)</i>			
In the view of the External/Intercollegiate Examiner, the standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which I am familiar. <i>(please tick)</i>			Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
If no, in what respects do they fall short? <i>(Max 300 words please)</i>			
In the view of the External/Intercollegiate Examiner, the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted. <i>(please tick)</i>			Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
If no, in what respects do they fall short? <i>(Max 300 words please)</i>			
Please list any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment procedures, that would be worth drawing to the attention of external audiences <i>(Max 300 words please)</i>			
As stated in previous reports, considerable effort is expended on order to ensure that students graduating from the distance learning programme reach the same standard as those from the more traditional 'in-house' college-based course(s). This is not easily achieved, and is a major strength of the programme.			

Part 2: The Programme

Part 2 is primarily for consideration by the Lead College/Consortium responsible for the academic direction of the programme.

Please give your comments on the following, including any particular strengths and weaknesses that you would like to identify:

Curriculum and learning materials:

- The balance and content of the course in relation to stated course objectives
- The effectiveness of the programme, as reflected by the standards achieved by candidates
- The resources dedicated to the programme

This is an excellent well-balanced course. The effectiveness of the programme in delivering its objectives is reflected in its well-deserved international reputation. Students come from a wide-range of backgrounds, and the learning materials and topics covered are appropriate for the diverse student intake. The modules are constantly being reviewed, and topical up-to date examples are used in the taught components wherever possible.

Design and structure of assessment:

- The appropriateness of the assessment methods employed and the balance between them, i.e. unseen written papers, essays/dissertations, orals, etc.
- The marking scheme and/or the scheme for the award of honours.
- The nature, spread and level of the examination questions.
- The choice of subject of essays/dissertations/reports (*if applicable*)
- The overall quality of assessment design and structure.

The essay topics, project areas, and examination questions covered the broad field of research extremely well. In all tasks, an appropriate depth and breadth of knowledge was demonstrated by the majority of students, with some doing particularly well. Academic standards were demonstrably high, and assessment processes and procedures were rigorously applied throughout.

If you have any other comments about the design, structure or delivery of the programme, please continue on a separate sheet.

Part 3: Standards

Part 3 will be considered by the Lead College and, if any matters relating to External provision as a whole are raised, by the External System centrally.

Please comment on the standards set for this award or award element, with reference to the national university system, published subject benchmarks and national qualifications frameworks.	
Please comment on the standards demonstrated by the candidates, including where possible candidates' performance in relation to their peers on comparable courses.	
Were you satisfied that the candidates were examined to the same standard as College-based students? <i>(applicable only to External or Intercollegiate Examiners who are also appointed to Boards of Examiners assessing College-based Students)</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>] N/A[<input type="checkbox"/>]
[Intercollegiate Examiners only] Was the standard of the examination consistent with that at your own College?	Yes[<input type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>] N/A[<input type="checkbox"/>]

Part 4: Assessment Procedures

Part 4 is for consideration by the Lead College and the External and Internal Student Administration (EISA) division of the University of London, in consultation if appropriate.

Information:	
Did you receive all necessary information upon appointment (Guidelines, Regulations, etc)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>]
Were you given the Scheme of Award for the degree as a whole, the assessment criteria and, where applicable, marking schemes for individual papers and individual questions?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>]
Did you receive this information in good time?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>]
Did you have sufficient access to, and the power to call upon, any material needed to make the required judgements?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>]
Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you	
Paper-setting:	
Were you invited to approve draft examination papers?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>]
Did you receive the draft papers in good time?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>] N/A[<input type="checkbox"/>]
Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the draft papers?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>] N/A[<input type="checkbox"/>]
Do you have any other comments on the paper-setting process?	

Scripts and other assessed material:	
Did you receive the scripts in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment of them?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
Did you see a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
Did you see a representative sample of scripts assessed as first class, borderline or fail?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
Were you satisfied with the standard of marking?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
Were you satisfied that the scripts were double-marked by Examiners or by Examiners paired with Assistant Examiners or Assessors?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
Board of Examiners meetings:	
Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
Were you able to attend the final Examiners' meeting?	Yes[] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the decisions made by the Board?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No []
Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
Were you able to endorse the decisions of the Board?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?	
Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken on board.	
Do you have any other comments? <i>Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary.</i>	

Part 1 - Summary of External/Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report

Please note that this part of your report will be made available to the public.

University of London External System			
Award (s) partially or wholly covered by this summary (eg BSc Economics)	MSc & PG Diploma in Epidemiology (DL)		
Subject Area or Modules (if applicable)			
Academic year examined (eg 2008-09) or Calendar year examined (eg 2009)	2008-09	Exam Month (eg May, June, October)	JUNE
Home institution and/or professional affiliation of the External/Intercollegiate Examiner	University College London		
In the view of the External/Intercollegiate Examiner, the standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level, in this subject. <i>(please tick)</i>			Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>]
If no, in what respects do they fall short? <i>(Max 300 words please)</i>			
In the view of the External/Intercollegiate Examiner, the standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which I am familiar. <i>(please tick)</i>			Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>]
If no, in what respects do they fall short? <i>(Max 300 words please)</i>			
In the view of the External/Intercollegiate Examiner, the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted. <i>(please tick)</i>			Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>]
If no, in what respects do they fall short? <i>(Max 300 words please)</i>			
Please list any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment procedures, that would be worth drawing to the attention of external audiences <i>(Max 300 words please)</i>			

Part 2: The Programme

Part 2 is primarily for consideration by the Lead College/ Consortium responsible for the academic direction of the programme.

Please give your comments on the following, including any particular strengths and weaknesses that you would like to identify:

Curriculum and learning materials:

- The balance and content of the course in relation to stated course objectives
- The effectiveness of the programme, as reflected by the standards achieved by candidates
- The resources dedicated to the programme

-

Design and structure of assessment:

- The appropriateness of the assessment methods employed and the balance between them, i.e. unseen written papers, essays/dissertations, orals, etc.
- The marking scheme and/or the scheme for the award of honours.
- The nature, spread and level of the examination questions.
- The choice of subject of essays/dissertations/reports (*if applicable*)
- The overall quality of assessment design and structure.

The assessment methods are appropriate with a good balance between written and numerical answers required. The marking schemes for each of the modules are detailed and generally excellent and the methods for combining results across the modules are appropriate. The examinations questions are excellent, covering a good spread of the course material and are generally assessed at an appropriate level. The development and new implementation this year of an online system for assessors to input their examination marks has worked well and has ensured that the double marking of each exam script by two examiners/assessors is done independently before final marks and grades are agreed. Overall, the quality of the assessment is excellent.

If you have any other comments about the design, structure or delivery of the programme, please continue on a separate sheet.

Part 3: Standards

Part 3 will be considered by the Lead College and, if any matters relating to External provision as a whole are raised, by the External System centrally.

Please comment on the standards set for this award or award element, with reference to the national university system, published subject benchmarks and national qualifications frameworks.	
Please comment on the standards demonstrated by the candidates, including where possible candidates' performance in relation to their peers on comparable courses.	
Were you satisfied that the candidates were examined to the same standard as College-based students? (<i>applicable only to External or Intercollegiate Examiners who are also appointed to Boards of Examiners assessing College-based Students</i>)	Yes[<input type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>] N/A[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
[Intercollegiate Examiners only] Was the standard of the examination consistent with that at your own College?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>] N/A[<input type="checkbox"/>]

Part 4: Assessment Procedures

Part 4 is for consideration by the Lead College and the External and Internal Student Administration (EISA) division of the University of London, in consultation if appropriate.

Information:	
Did you receive all necessary information upon appointment (Guidelines, Regulations, etc)	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>]
Were you given the Scheme of Award for the degree as a whole, the assessment criteria and, where applicable, marking schemes for individual papers and individual questions?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>]
Did you receive this information in good time?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>]
Did you have sufficient access to, and the power to call upon, any material needed to make the required judgements?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>]
Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you	
Paper-setting:	
Were you invited to approve draft examination papers?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>]
Did you receive the draft papers in good time?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>] N/A[<input type="checkbox"/>]
Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the draft papers?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[<input type="checkbox"/>] N/A[<input type="checkbox"/>]
Do you have any other comments on the paper-setting process?	
Despite the instigation this year of additional checking when the examination papers are written, a couple of errors and inconsistencies in numbers occurred in this years examination papers. Further checks and procedures to try to eliminate these completely in future years are being developed at the LSHTM.	

Scripts and other assessed material:	
Did you receive the scripts in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment of them?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
Did you see a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
Did you see a representative sample of scripts assessed as first class, borderline or fail?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
Were you satisfied with the standard of marking?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
Were you satisfied that the scripts were double-marked by Examiners or by Examiners paired with Assistant Examiners or Assessors?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
Board of Examiners meetings:	
Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
Were you able to attend the final Examiners' meeting?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No []
Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the decisions made by the Board?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No []
Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]
Were you able to endorse the decisions of the Board?	Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No[]

How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?
Procedures and arrangements were similar to previous years and were appropriate.
Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken on board.
Further checks to ensure that errors did not occur in the setting of the examination papers were instigated this year by the London School of Hygiene.
Do you have any other comments? <i>Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary.</i>