

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT Received 11/07/2019

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

PRHS

Subject(s):

Philosophy

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Modules in Philosophy of Science, Philosophy of Language, and Epistemology

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

BA

Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards

Points of innovation and/or good practice

Please highlight areas of innovation or good practice within the programmes or processes you have been involved with in this box.

The programme includes a range of teaching and assessment methods, e.g. the innovative use of weekly reflective journal entries submitted via the VLE in the Philosophy of Biology module. Assessment methods including essays and short answer exams are succeeding in promoting engagement with module material across the board: students were well prepared and displayed excellent subject knowledge in exams.

Processes for supporting fair and transparent assessment including maintenance of assessment standards are good: the module monitor form is particularly helpful in explaining how marks were agreed on modules.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.

The main change this year was to the processes for external examining, in response to comments made in previous years about the role of the external examiner (whose role seemed to be primarily as an additional, and less efficient, module moderator). This year, rather than sampling a range of assessments from every module, examiners were directed instead to take a more in depth look at a selected sample of modules, as well as overviews of the remaining modules to check for anything that looked anomalous. This meant as examiner I had time to look extensively over module materials for four modules (including handbooks, VLE pages, student module evaluation data, and assessments), and to take a more thorough look at the marking on those modules. As a result I felt I was able to offer constructive feedback and suggestions on how those modules were running, including recommendations about assessments for future years (which have been forwarded separately). I also surveyed module statistics and monitor reports for the remaining modules and had access to assessments if I thought anything looked unusual. This to me strikes me as a much more productive use of external examiners' time (I still used all the allotted time on the day, as well as spending time looking at some of the materials on the specified modules in advance, so no time is saved, but it is used in a more strategic manner), and promises to contribute to the enhancement of the teaching programme.

Matters for Urgent Attention

If there are any areas which you think require urgent attention before the programme is offered again please note them in this box

None

For Examiners in the first year of appointment only

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Handbook?	Y / N
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses to these?	Y / N
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	Y / N

For Examiners completing their term of appointment only

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	Y
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	Y
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y
7.	Have you acted as an External Examiner Mentor?	N

Please comment on your experience of the programme(s) over the period of your appointment, remarking in particular on changes from year to year and the progressive development and enhancement of the learning and teaching provision, on standards achieved, on marking and assessment and the procedures of the School

I have been consistently impressed by the quality of undergraduate degree programmes in Philosophy at Leeds. Students are being taught at the highest level, including modules informed by cutting edge research. It's been particularly nice to see – even in the modules at the more abstract end of philosophy that I look at in the programme – a move towards diversifying module material to include some 'off the beaten track' topics, e.g. the material on slurs and on testimony and epistemic injustice in the philosophy of language module, which students clearly engaged with interest. Marking standards have remained high, with some impressive student performances. It's been great that there has been more than one examiner for the Philosophy modules, as it meant that I did not have to look at material that was too far outside of my 'comfort zone'.

I thoroughly endorse the new external examining procedures. Over the course of their tenure, each external examiner should be able to take an in depth look at most or all of the modules in a programme, gaining a much fuller sense of how the Leeds programme works and any issues that might arise. This is a much better use of examiners' time and expertise than as glorified last minute module monitors, and should make it easier for examiners to provide the information that you request on this form with greater confidence.

Standards

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	Y
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Y
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y

Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.

The programme structure offers a good grounding across a range of topics in philosophy, appropriate to an undergraduate degree in a research intensive university.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
-----	---	---

Please explain how this is/could be achieved (examples might include: curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research)

Curriculum design is certainly informed by research in the subject; students also have the opportunity to undertake independent research in their dissertations.

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
<i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
<i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<i>Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs, in particular: the design and structure of the assessment methods, and the arrangements for the marking of modules and the classification of awards; the quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods that may be indicated by student performance.</i>		
As mentioned in previous reports, the mix of assessment methods including short answer exams, more standard essay exams, and written essays, seems conducive to nurturing depth and breadth in philosophy.		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y
<i>Please comment on the academic standards demonstrated by the students and, where possible, their performance in relation to students on comparable courses; the strengths and weaknesses of the students as a cohort:</i>		
By and large the assessments were well designed to allow for students to display a range of achievement. I did note in two of the modules I looked at this year that the assessment design didn't adequately distinguish between the merely good and the truly excellent students (with most students who had prepared adequately doing very well), but I have made recommendations for future changes to ensure that students are properly challenged by these assessments. In my experience at Leeds this has been the exception rather than the rule.		
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i>		

The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiner's role, powers and responsibilities in the examination process?	Y
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y

26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Y
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p>		

Other comments

Please use this box if you wish to make any further comments not covered elsewhere on the form

Thanks to all who have been involved administering the examining process over my time as examiner, who have responded to any issues I have had efficiently and helpfully.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)*Title and Name of Examiner:*

Subject(s):

Philosophy

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Modules in Philosophy of Science, Philosophy of Language, and Epistemology

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

BA, BSc

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Assessment Officer

Faculty / School of:

Philosophy, Religion and History of Science

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

If the individual responding to the report is not the Head of School please state their position within the School.*Completing the School response**

The completed School response (including the full original report) must be sent directly to the External Examiner. A copy must also be emailed to the Quality Assurance Team at gat@leeds.ac.uk. External Examiners should receive a formal response no later than six weeks after receipt of the original report.

Response to Points of innovation and/or good practice

We are pleased to hear that our range of assessment methods seems appropriate and that monitors' reports and other checking procedures are working well to maintain a clear overview of our assessment and monitoring practices.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

We are genuinely delighted that the amendments we have made to the guidance and information we supply to external examiners have been successful in enabling the examiners' time to be used more effectively, focusing in greater depth on specific modules and other aspects of our programmes rather than trying to sample students' work from multiple modules. We are immensely grateful to you and other external examiners for your part in prompting us to introduce these changes. They are certainly proving to be effective from our point of view and we shall continue to reflect on further improvements that might be implemented.

Response to Matters for Urgent Attention

If any areas have been identified for urgent attention before the programme is offered again please provide a specific response to them here:

N/A

Response to questions 1-7 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

It is gratifying to hear that the range and quality of material covered in our philosophy programmes remains of a high standard.

Standards

Response to questions 8 to 16 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

We are pleased that the overall shape and structure of the programmes we offer is strong, enabling teaching staff to deploy their own research expertise and students, especially in their final year, to pursue in-depth research projects of their own.

Assessment and Feedback

Response to questions 17 to 19 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

Your module- and assessment-specific remarks have been extremely helpful in identifying areas where sharper distinctions need to be made to ensure that excellence in student work is properly recognized and distinguished from merely good work. As a School, as we continue to diversify our methods of assessment, it is essential that we give careful attention to devising marking criteria that are both consistent across similar modes of assessment and enable markers to make sufficiently fine-grained distinctions. So thank you again for your observations.

The Progression and Awards Process

Response to questions 20-35 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

We are pleased to note that there are no problems with our progression and award processes.

Other comments

Response to items included in the 'Other Comments' section of the report

I and my colleagues could not be more grateful for all your diligent work for the School over the last four years. Your recommendations and advice have been invariably perceptive: constructively critical where warranted and encouraging where deserved. On several occasions, you have gone above and beyond what is expected of an external examiner in the promptness and thoroughness of your responses to requests we have made. Thank you and best wishes.

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT Received 25/06/2019

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

School of Philosophy, Religion and History of Science (PRHS)

Subject(s):

Philosophy

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Programmes
 BA Philosophy
 BA Philosophy, Politics and Economics
 BA Economics and Philosophy
 BA Management and Philosophy
 BA Philosophy and Politics
 BA Philosophy and Sociology
 BA Philosophy and Social Policy

Indicative list of modules
 PHIL2221 Ancient Philosophy
 PHIL2232 History of Modern Philosophy
 PHIL2295 Ethics of Life and Death
 PHIL2321 Political Philosophy
 PHIL2322 Moral Philosophy
 PHIL3111 Nietzsche and Schopenhauer
 PHIL3220 Hume
 PHIL3321 Metaethics
 PHIL3322 Aesthetics and Philosophy of Art
 PHIL3700 Feminist Philosophy
 PHIL3721 Advanced Topics in Value Theory
 PHIL3722 Philosophy and Literature
 PRHS3000 Independent Research Project
 PRHS3001 Integrated Research Project

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

BA

Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards

Points of innovation and/or good practice

Please highlight areas of innovation or good practice within the programmes or processes you have been involved with in this box.

It is pleasing that the School has adopted our recommendation from previous years, and is now using external examiners to review specific modules in depth, rather than reading a lot of material in a rather superficial way. This enabled me to get a better sense of the student experience at the module level, and see how they were performing as a cohort.

In one of the modules I reviewed, which was a new third year module on Kant (PHIL3112), I was impressed by the evident care and commitment of the lecturer in supporting students on this difficult topic, which was clearly also appreciated by the students themselves. The use of a 'buddying system' to enable students to discuss their ideas with other students is an approach I had not seen before, and seems to have worked well.

In another module (PRHS3100: Existentialism and Phenomenology), blog posts were used to engage students in the material, and also as part of the assessment, both of which appeared to be successful innovations.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.

As mentioned above, the school is now using external examiners in a different and more effective way. We were also provided with more statistical information than on previous years, which was also helpful.

Matters for Urgent Attention

If there are any areas which you think require urgent attention before the programme is offered again please note them in this box

n/a

For Examiners in the first year of appointment only

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Handbook?	Y
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses to these?	Y
3.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Mentor?	N

For Examiners completing their term of appointment only

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	Y
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	Y
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y
7.	Have you acted as an External Examiner Mentor?	N

Please comment on your experience of the programme(s) over the period of your appointment, remarking in particular on changes from year to year and the progressive development and enhancement of the learning and teaching provision, on standards achieved, on marking and assessment and the procedures of the School

The School has continued to maintain its high level of provision and attainment, and to offer intellectual exciting degree programmes that challenge their students. The introduction of the new module on Kant mentioned above is a welcome development.

Standards

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	Y
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Y
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y
<p>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</p> <p>The programmes run by the School are well-designed and clearly structured, and I am satisfied that they attain the learning outcomes.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y / N

It is clear that the general ethos of the department fits the model of 'research led teaching', where students (particularly in the third year) are exposed to cutting edge research that relates to the work of the staff concerned. This is an admirable approach, and there is every indication that it engaged the interest of students.		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
<i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
<i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
Leeds offers a strong package of assessment methods, mostly focusing on traditional assessment (essays and exams), but with some variations (e.g. contribution to on-line discussions, and presentations). These methods seem appropriate to the ILOs, but some further innovation is always worth considering – e.g. pre-released exams.		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y
<i>Please comment on the academic standards demonstrated by the students and, where possible, their performance in relation to students on comparable courses; the strengths and weaknesses of the students as a cohort:</i>		
On the evidence of work reviewed, students are given the opportunity to give of their best, and many performed strongly. I am confident that their performance is in line with that of comparable institutions.		
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i>		
There was a particular difficulty this year with a second year Politics module: due to the illness of the module leader, teaching was covered by several different staff brought in at short notice, while marking was carried out by a former PhD student whose marking was unduly harsh, and who in several cases provided comments to students that were excessively critical and negative. The department took steps to check through the marking, and we also agreed that marks should be systematically raised, to bring the results of this module into line with what would normally be expected, to avoid disadvantaging the students. I am satisfied that this problem could not reasonably have been foreseen by the department, who took all reasonable steps to resolve the difficulties, and I am satisfied that the outcome is the right one for the students concerned.		

The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiner's role, powers and responsibilities in the examination process?	Y
-----	---	---

21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	N
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:

I attended the main exam board, which was well conducted and organized. However, because other departments had moved their exam boards to the following week, not all marks were available for dual students, which meant many were left unclassified, and will need to be checked later, which is not ideal.

Also, I was invited to the pre-exam board at very short notice, and so was unable to attend. It would help if this task was assigned to one of the examiners early on in the process, so the date can be kept free as an appointment. I was consulted on one difficult case, and was satisfied that it was given due care and attention.

Not all markers put exam marks on scripts. It would be good to include these marks, I think, as it may be useful in case of transcription errors that can't be checked later.

In general, I was impressed by the care and professionalism of the administrative staff running the examination process, and the way things were handled.

Other comments

Please use this box if you wish to make any further comments not covered elsewhere on the form

There was quite a lot of difficulty getting access to Minerva this year, which slowed down the examination process for me: I only got access a few days before the exam board. It would help if this process could be checked and improved for the future.

In future, as part of the documentation we get on the modules being reviewed, it would be good if this routinely contained the student evaluation returns on the module. Also, in presenting statistical information on grade classifications for a module, it would be helpful if this could be put in percentages rather than actual numbers, which would make it easier to compare statistics across modules. It would also be helpful to get statistics on grade classifications across the whole year, so we can tell if any modules are outliers. On the modules I looked at, it seemed that the number of Firsts being awarded was quite low, but it is hard to know if that is a more general problem without school wide statistics being provided.

Finally, markers seem not to use a common rubric when assessing essays. This may be useful so the students know what to expect from feedback, and to get some uniformity in their responses from markers, while the rubric can make clearer to students how marking criteria are being used. This is an option that could therefore perhaps be considered by the department.

Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report**Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)***Title and Name of Examiner:**Subject(s):*

Philosophy

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Programmes
 BA Philosophy
 BA Philosophy, Politics and Economics
 BA Economics and Philosophy
 BA Management and Philosophy
 BA Philosophy and Politics
 BA Philosophy and Sociology
 BA Philosophy and Social Policy

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

BA

*Title and Name of Responder:**Position*:*

Assessment Officer

Faculty / School of:

School of Philosophy, Religion and History of Science

*Address for communication:**Email:**Telephone:*

**If the individual responding to the report is not the Head of School please state their position within the School.*

Completing the School response

The completed School response (including the full original report) must be sent directly to the External Examiner. A copy must also be emailed to the Quality Assurance Team at qat@leeds.ac.uk. External Examiners should receive a formal response no later than six weeks after receipt of the original report.

Response to Points of innovation and/or good practice

We are pleased to hear that our revised external examining procedures are working well. As a School, we are extremely grateful to you and other external examiners for advising us on this matter. Your comments on the new PHIL3112 Kant module and PRHS3100 Existentialism and Phenomenology module are also encouraging and appreciated.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

Again, we note that the improvements to our external examining system are proving to be effective. We shall continue to seek ways of ensuring that external examiners' time is used in a focused and productive manner.

Response to Matters for Urgent Attention

If any areas have been identified for urgent attention before the programme is offered again please provide a specific response to them here:

N/A

Response to questions 1-7 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

It is gratifying to hear that the School's level of provision and attainment has remained high and that certain enhancements continue to be made, such as the introduction of the PHIL3112 Kant module.

Standards

Response to questions 8 to 16 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

We are glad that the programmes offered by the School are deemed to be well-designed, clearly structured and suitable for attaining the intended learning outcomes. Each of our programmes undergoes an annual review process and your comments will be fed into that process. With regard to research-led teaching, this is certainly something that we expect to be most clearly discernible in upper-level modules, and it is encouraging to hear that this is the case.

Assessment and Feedback

Response to questions 17 to 19 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

It is good to hear that our range of assessment methods is appropriate. Within the School as a whole, pre-released exams do feature in some of our modules. These modules (such as THEO2040 Modern Theologians, THEO2201 Hindu Traditions, and THEO3040 Ideologies of Hebrew Bible Texts and Readers) are currently all on the theology and religious studies side of the School, but adopting this method of assessment remains an option for our philosophy modules. It is something we shall bear in mind when designing or modifying future assessments.

Your assistance with PHIL2321 Political Philosophy in 2018/19 has been enormously helpful. As you note, the School faced particular difficulties with running this module, owing to the illness of the expected module leader. The time you devoted to this module during your visit in June, your input into the decision-making process concerning how to mitigate any initial harshness in the marking of essays, and your heartening comments on the overall outcome are all greatly appreciated.

The Progression and Awards Process

Response to questions 20-35 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

Your comments on our progression and awards process are extremely helpful and have been duly noted. The issue with the timing of our exam board should not arise again. In 2019/20, we have pushed the date back to later in June. We shall ensure that invitations to attend both the exam board and the pre-exam board are sent out as far in advance as is feasible.

The absence of marks from the cover sheet of exam scripts is something that has also been noted by another external examiner. We shall make sure that markers are made aware of the problem.

Other comments

Response to items included in the 'Other Comments' section of the report

We are extremely sorry about the problem with accessing Minerva. Unfortunately, the problem seems to be one that we cannot resolve at School level, and I am not, at present, sure what can be done about it. The School's administrative team will continue to liaise with relevant staff from IT Services to try to secure easier access. We are grateful for your patience with this.

Your recommendations of additional information that we could seek to provide for external examiners are very helpful indeed. I shall discuss these recommendations with administrative colleagues (such as) and see whether we can implement them as part of the external examining process during the current academic year.

Your point about marking rubrics is important. The School has a set of marking criteria, set out in the School's Code of Practice on Assessment. We expect all markers to mark to these criteria, and students are made aware of where the criteria are to be found. So I presume that what you are referring to are rubrics devised by module leaders as part of their method of providing feedback and provisional marks via Minerva. In 2017, a sub-group of the School's Taught Student Education Committee composed a guidance document for markers, specifying the types of feedback comments that students tend to find most helpful. Provided markers adhere to those guidelines, we do allow some flexibility concerning the format in which the comments are provided. We shall keep an eye on this

matter, and I shall contact you to ask for a little further detail on the kinds of inconsistencies that might be problematic.

Once again, we are exceedingly grateful for your assistance and expert advice.