



8 March 2012

[Redacted]

Dear [Redacted]

**Re: External Examiner report - MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration) 2010-11**

I am writing on behalf of the College of Medical and Dental Sciences to thank you for your submission of the above report and the time you have invested in producing it. I enclose a letter from Dr [Redacted], Programme Director and can confirm that the College is happy with the comments she has made in response to your suggestions.

Once again, may I take this opportunity to thank you for your thoughts and input into the above programme.

Kind regards

Yours sincerely

[Redacted signature]

**Professor [Redacted]  
Director of Education**

cc: [Redacted]



8 March 2012

[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank-you for your input to the programme during the last year and for the help and advice you have provided. It is much appreciated. The team's responses to the comments in your report are provided below.

**'It would be useful to see how formative assessments are integrated into teaching and learning activities'**

**Response**

*The formative assessments have two purposes.*

*A 500 word written critique is submitted and students receive individualised feedback focusing on assessing the student's level of academic work – ie are they able to critique at masters level. This piece of work occurs very early in the programme and provides information to the student which supports their learning. The aim here is to provide the student with feedback to enable them to develop their writing skills.*

*Students present (singly or in groups) formative seminars during the first six months of the programme. These seminars support the students in their own specific level of learning but they also provide a resource to the whole group regarding the specific topics covered. In all the formative assessments, students are provided with detailed individualised feedback.*

***'Encourages programme team to consider and develop clear and transparent marking criteria. Criteria could also be more clearly linked to learning outcomes.'***

**Response**

*This aspect is on-going. We have recently reviewed the marking sheet and when reviewing the project marking we felt the criteria were suitable and assessed the masters level of the work. However, a closer integration between the learning outcomes and the criteria is undoubtedly desirable and we have discussed this at programme review and with the board. We feel that it would be useful to do some developmental work linking the outcomes to criteria on one module as a pilot. This will be carried out this year.*

## **'Not always clear how consistent the marking is between different markers'**

### **Response**

*We do spend considerable time cross-checking marking. There are always two markers or one marker and an internal moderator. For seminars/ posters they are double marked and an internal moderator also samples the marking. Marking is therefore always checked by at least two markers. In the case of a dispute, it is referred to the module leader who will enlist a third marker. Scripts where there has been a dispute are also seen by the external examiner. Since reviewing the criteria and the marking form we have had no disputes between markers which could not be easily resolved on the project module.*

With Best Wishes



