

External Examiners' Report

Please note that the completed report form will be made available to students and staff, please do not identify individual students or staff by name. If you wish to bring to the attention of the University issues pertaining to a confidential matter please do this separately by contacting the Head of Quality Assurance at the University of Law.

General details	
Name of External Examiner	Victoria Broadbridge
Home Institution	University of Portsmouth
Programme being examined and level	BSc Digital Marketing / BSc Digital Management
Modules examined	Level 4 – Introduction to Digital Marketing Level 4 – Digital Ethics Level 5 – Digital Marketing Analytics
Academic Year for which this report is relevant	2021-2022

1 Academic Issues	
1.1 Were the standards of the assessments set at the appropriate level?	YES
Across all three modules I reviewed this year the level and standards were consistent with what I would expect to see.	
1.2 Were the assessments (formative and summative) well-designed? Did they assess appropriately the learning outcomes set for the programme?	YES
Please comment. The assessments were well considered and appropriately addressed the learning outcomes for the modules. The modules utilised a few different types of assessments which provided variety for the students.	

1.3 Was the standard of performance attained by candidates in general at an appropriate level?	YES
The students have performed in line with my expectations of both level 4 and level 5 students.	

1.4 Was the method and general standard of marking satisfactory and consistent?	YES
---	------------

Initially on some of the modules I had to ask for the marking to be reviewed as there were inconsistencies in the marks and feedback. After I raised this issue the marking and feedback was re evaluated and sent for me to review again. At this point I was happy that the marks and feedback were reflective of what had been submitted.

2 Administrative Issues: please make any comments you wish to make on:

2.1 The process of setting assessments.	2.1 – no comments to make.
2.2 The administration of assessments.	2.2 – no comments to make.
2.3 The moderation process.	2.3 – ensure greater focus on checking the marks and feedback before they are sent out to students, in one instance students had two sets of feedback with two different grades because the markers had not communicated correctly and had both marked the same scripts. This is a basic mistake that should have been picked up before the marks were sent out to students.
2.4 The conduct of the Examination Board.	2.4 – No comments.
2.5 Procedures relating to candidates with special needs/concessions	2.5 – No comments.
	2.6 – No comments.

2.6 Any other procedural issues.	
----------------------------------	--

3 Quality Assurance Issues	
3.1 Were assessment policies and your duties as external examiner adequately explained to you?	YES
3.2 Did you have adequate briefing and guidance sufficient for you to fulfil your role effectively as an external examiner?	YES
3.3 Did you have adequate access to any material needed (including assessment regulations, student handbook, programme specification and module descriptors) to make the required judgements?	YES
3.4 Were your comments during the assessment process and at the Examination Board considered appropriately	YES
3.5 Has appropriate action been taken in respect of comments made in your last examiner's report?	N/A
No comments.	

4a) Areas of good practice

Please provide a description or bullet point list of any particular areas of good practice in relation to standards and assessment processes that would be worthy of dissemination to a wider audience.

- Consistent assessment briefs and marking criteria's

4b) Areas which enhance the student learning experience/ or suggestions for enhancement

Please provide a description or bullet point list of any particular areas which you would like to note as enhancing the student learning experience or areas which, in your view, could be enhanced.

- In one module, feedback that is directly related to the students own work (as opposed to generic feedback copied across all students) would have elevated the student experience.

5a) Meetings with students (if appropriate)

Please comment on any issues raised. (Please do not mention names in the report)

Not applicable.

5b) Meetings with staff (if appropriate)

Please comment on any issues raised. (Please do not mention names in the report)

Not applicable.

6. Other comments

Please comment on any other issues which you wish to raise

No comments.

Signed:

VBroadbridge

I understand that this report (in full or part) will be available to students.

Date: 03/10/2022

Please return this report by email to Head of Quality Assurance at the University of Law, Ruth Tennant-Alderman (ruth.tennant-alderman@law.ac.uk). Fees are paid on receipt of this report.