



External Examiners' Handbook
Academic Quality and Development
August 2019

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. University awards and modular frameworks.....	2
3. Responsibility of the University's examiners.....	3
4. Roles and functions of assessment boards and associated issues	7
5. Outline calendar of activity for external examiners	13
6. Quality assurance and the role of external examiners.....	16
7. External examiner's annual report.....	17
8. External examiner fees.....	18
9. External examiner appointment process	19
10. Documentation made available to external examiners	20
11. Equality and diversity in the University	21
12. Contact details	22
Appendix A, guidelines for briefing external examiners	24
Appendix B, Service levels for nominations, reports and payments	25
Nominations (and extensions and reallocations).....	25
Annual reports.....	25
Fees payment	25
Expenses payment.....	26

1. Introduction

Dear Examiner,

Welcome to the London Metropolitan University External Examiners' Handbook.

This Handbook has been compiled to assist you in the essential role you play in the University's quality assurance system in guaranteeing:

- first, that the performance of our students on taught courses is equivalent to the performance of their peers on comparable courses elsewhere;
- second, that the design and delivery of the courses and the assessment schemes which are associated with the courses enable standards to be maintained; and
- third, that, within the University's Regulations, justice is done to each individual student.

We have decided to address this Handbook to internal and external examiners alike because both groups contribute to the effective maintenance of standards of taught courses, albeit bringing different perspectives to bear. Although we value very highly the objective input from external examiners, the guaranteeing of standards is a collective process and that is what the Handbook describes.

The Handbook also offers practical details for new staff and new external examiners in describing the University's system of courses, awards and the regulatory frameworks within which they operate.

For external examiners, details are given about the process of annual reporting and fee payment.

London Metropolitan University is one of Britain's largest universities and one of the foremost providers of undergraduate, postgraduate, professional and vocational education and training.

Academic Quality and Development (AQD)
August 2019

2. University awards and modular frameworks

The academic year is split into two semesters each of 15 weeks. Courses within the University Undergraduate Modular Scheme (UUMS) are based on 15 and 30 credit modules (each credit denoting 10 teaching hours, and most courses are based primarily on 30 credit modules), with 120 credits at each of Certificate, Intermediate and Honours levels for Honours degree courses and awards. Foundation Degree courses also sit within this structure at Certificate and Intermediate levels, as do smaller award schemes such as the Open Language Programme.

Courses within the Postgraduate Scheme are primarily based on 20 credit modules (denoting 200 learning hours), normally demanding 6 taught modules and a 60 credit dissertation (or equivalent) module, and generally utilise the summer studies period in addition to the Autumn and Spring semesters.

The University also offers a variety of Professional and Personal Development awards which operate on similar principles to the main schemes.

All the University's courses are validated in accordance with the procedures described in the Quality Manual, designed to ensure that students' learning experiences are commensurate with the standards of similar courses offered by other UK universities. All courses are regulated by the University's Academic Regulations, which cover not only assessment, awards, and generic principles for schemes and courses, but also admission, accreditation of prior (certificated or experiential) learning, and student responsibilities (concerning enrolment, fees, academic misconduct, mitigation and academic appeals).

3. Responsibility of the University's examiners

The full Academic Regulations can be viewed here: [Academic Regulations](#)

The sections below deal with those aspects particularly relevant to the conduct of the assessment process.

1. The roles of the University's external and internal examiners shall be, collectively, to ensure that the standard of the University's Awards is maintained, that the performance of students is assessed in relation to those standards and that justice is done to individual students.

2. External Examiners – confirming academic standards

2.1 External Examiners, who shall not be members of staff of the University, shall be appointed as Subject Standards Examiners to modules, or as Awards Examiners to sit on the University Awards Board and as External Examiners for research degrees (Please note that the responsibilities of external examiners to research degrees are not covered here and information pertaining to this category of external examiner can be found in Section 5 of the Academic Regulations).

3. Subject Standards Examiners shall:

- 3.1. confirm that the assessment process is conducted in accordance with the University's Academic Regulations, the approved scheme regulatory frameworks, course specific regulations;
- 3.2. confirm that students have been assessed fairly and have been judged on whether they have achieved the aims and learning outcomes of the course as stated in the course specification and the University's general educational aims;
- 3.3. confirm that the range of marks given by internal examiners to students fairly reflects the standards of those students' performance, having regard to standards elsewhere in UK higher education.

In order to carry out these duties, they shall:

- 3.4. be consulted on proposed examination papers and coursework assignments, and be consulted on any proposed changes to the assessment scheme for the course; where issues of timing preclude changes to coursework assignments being made in response to external examiner comments the Module Leader will address them via the annual monitoring processes and specifically the Module Log;
- 3.5. see a sample of the students' work (see 16 below) where the marks awarded contribute to the classification of the intended awards. Items of coursework submitted up to and including the end of week nine of the semester will normally be returned to students for feedback purposes and will not, therefore, form part of any sample sent to the Subject Standards Examiner.

Modules at Preparatory and Certificate levels will only be sampled by External Examiners where the outcome contributes to the classification of a student's intended award or where required by professional bodies;

- 3.6. supply comments to the Module Internal Examiner and the Subject Standards Board on the range of marks awarded after having undertaken external sampling;
- 3.7. affirm (normally by electronic correspondence) that the marks proposed by the Module Internal Examiner(s) are appropriate for confirmation and publication to students or recommend to the Chair of the Subject Standards Board that a remarking of some or all of the components of assessment be undertaken prior to the publication of marks. (It should be noted that Subject Standards Examiners are not authorised to request alteration to the marks of individual students);
- 3.8. attend annually one or more meetings at which student performance on modules is reviewed and academic standards monitored;
- 3.9. be consulted from time to time about any proposed changes to the approved scheme regulatory framework or course specific regulations which will directly affect students currently on the course (see Academic Regulations, Section 2.1 Regulation 49).

4. Awards Examiners shall:

- 4.1. confirm that the conferment of awards has been reached in accordance with the University's Academic Regulations and that the process of conferment has been conducted in accordance with good practice in higher education;
 - 4.2. attend Awards Board meetings at which decisions on the conferment of awards are made;
 - 4.3. participate in the monitoring of academic standards and review of assessment policy.
5. To carry out their responsibilities Subject Standards examiners shall be:
- 5.1. competent in assessing students' knowledge and skills at higher education or, where applicable, further education level;
 - 5.2. expert in the field of study concerned and with an appropriate specialist level of expertise matched to the aims of the course or programme of research.
6. To carry out their responsibilities Awards Examiners shall be:
- 6.1. experienced in examining at subject level and also competent to take an overview of a course and/or scheme and/or broad quality assurance/quality enhancement matters.

7. All external examiners shall be:
 - 7.1. impartial in judgement;
 - 7.2. properly briefed on their role, the scheme, the course, the module and the University's requirements;
 - 7.3. governed by the University's Academic Regulations;
 - 7.4. paid a fee set by the University and recorded in a contract; for taught courses this is calculated in relation to the examiner's annual workload and is subject to the production of an annual report;
 - 7.5. independent. To ensure this, external examiners shall not concurrently act as members of a panel established to review the course which, or the School in which, they examine.
8. New Subject Standards and Awards examiners shall be inducted as soon as possible after appointment, preferably by visiting the University and meeting key staff in Schools. The induction shall cover, as appropriate: key dates, the examiner's role in relation to the examining team as a whole, the course, the module, syllabuses and teaching methods, the learning outcomes and the assessment scheme and the scheme regulatory framework and course specific regulations.

Internal examiners - marking students' work

9. Internal examiners shall be members of staff of the University appointed as examiners with responsibility for marking items of assessed work in which they themselves have competence. They are members of the relevant Subject Standards Board and accountable to that board for the probity of the assessment process. They shall mark work on an objective, impartial basis, in line with clear marking criteria.

Anonymity

10. Students' assessed work shall be anonymous when marked, except where the nature of the assignment or submission method prevents this.

Internal double-marking

11. The purpose of double-marking is:
 - to perform a moderating role;
 - to ensure consistency;
 - to examine special cases;
 - to give confidence to students that marking will be objective and impartial.
12. There shall be a Module Internal Examiner having overall responsibility for all assessment matters relating to a particular module. In the case of all courses, for each item of assessed work in the module, there shall be a minimum of two internal examiners of students' work one of whom may be the Module Internal Examiner.

13. The first internal examiner shall mark all work submitted. The second internal examiner shall mark at least 20% of the work submitted, subject to a minimum of 20 items (10 for postgraduate dissertations), or, if fewer, the total number of items submitted. At Intermediate, Honours, and Masters levels, the work shall be spread across all degree class bands and failing grades. At Certificate level, all work falling within the 35% to 45% range shall be double-marked.
14. The role of the second internal examiner is to check the use of marking criteria and exercise moderation over the marks across the group of students. Where there is a team of internal examiners associated with a module, the Module Internal Examiner shall normally perform the moderating role.
15. Internal examiners shall normally resolve disagreements on marks by discussion and reach a consensus. Where consensus is not reached, another appropriate internal examiner's view shall be sought by the Module Internal Examiner and a majority position reached.

External sampling

16. Subject Standards Examiners appointed to modules at Intermediate, Honours and Masters levels (and where applicable Preparatory and Certificate levels – refer to 3.5 above) shall be sent a sample of students' work to enable them to carry out their full responsibilities (refer to 3 above). Normally this will be a minimum of 20 items of assessed work for each module (or, if fewer, the total number of items of assessed work submitted). This shall be spread across the range of assessment tasks and all classification bands and failing grades. For postgraduate dissertations the normal sample size will be 10 items of assessed work.

Feedback to students

17. Feedback on all items of assessed coursework shall be given to students; feedback on examinations may be requested by students. In accordance with the Data Protection Acts 1984 and 1998 students have a right to see the comments of internal examiners on their performance. These include comments made on the item of assessed work itself or on cover sheets provided for the purpose of feedback. The latter method shall be used wherever possible. Feedback on marks shall normally be reported in percentage marks, with the proviso that such marks are provisional and subject to change, if given before confirmation of marks by the Assessment Board.

It should be noted that External Examiners will normally view only a sample of student work; Subject Standards Boards are not permitted, therefore, to adjust the marks of individual students. Where an External Examiner has concerns about the marks awarded to the students who have formed the sample these should be reported to the board where appropriate action (for example the remarking by the Internal Examiners of all assignments or those within a particular mark range) can be determined.

4. Roles and functions of assessment boards and associated issues

1. Assessment Regulations and further information

- Academic Regulations section 8.3 comprises the Regulations on assessment and Assessment Boards. Key points are reproduced below, in sub-sections 2 to 6.
- Further sub-sections provide additional information on aspects which directly relate to Assessment Boards and External Examiners.

2. Delegation of degree awarding powers

- Degree awarding powers are vested in the Board of Governors of the University. The Board of Governors has delegated its authority to Academic Board in respect of awards made to individual students.
- Academic Board has delegated to the University Awards Board acting on its behalf, the conferment of awards, such as degrees, diplomas and certificates on individual students, subject to the University's Regulations and course specific regulations.
- The Director of Student Journey or nominee, having consulted with the Heads of School shall recommend to the Chair of the University Awards Board the configuration of a tier of Subject Standards Boards through which the assessment of individual modules is managed. Requests to alter the configuration of a Subject Standards Board should be made by the Head of the relevant School to the Secretary to the Awards Board, normally before the start of the session.
- Following the approved nomination process for external examiners (as set down in the Quality Manual), Academic Board has delegated the appointment, on its behalf, of all internal and external examiners for taught courses to the Pro Vice-Chancellor Academic Outcomes and delegated to the Awards Board sub-committee for Research Degrees the appointment of all internal and external examiners for research degrees. Heads of School are responsible for the nomination of Chairs and Vice-Chairs of Subject Standards Boards (and for reporting them to the Secretary to the Awards Board) and of Internal and External Examiners.

3. Subject Standards Boards

- Subject Standards Boards shall be responsible for setting and monitoring the standard of student achievement and the confirmation of marks for the assessment and reassessment of individual students at the level of the module. If made through due process, the academic judgements of Subject Standards Boards shall be final. Subject Standards Boards shall not normally be associated with programmes of research.
- No other body shall confirm marks with the exception that the University Awards Board may do so where Subject Standards Examiners have agreed the marking standards of any sample submitted to them but a quorate sub-committee of the Standards Board has for any reason been unable to meet. Where marks are the subject of an appeal against a decision of an Assessment Board, and that appeal is upheld, the action shall be progressed

under the auspices of the Subject Standards Board.

- Heads of School shall certify annually to Academic Board that appropriate standards obtain in the subject area.

4. The University Awards Board

- The University Awards Board shall confer awards for all taught provision of the University. Awards shall be conferred on the basis of the marks confirmed by Subject Standards Boards, which the Awards Board shall have no power to change. If made through due process, the academic judgements of the Awards Board shall be final. The Awards Board may exercise its academic judgement to confer awards in cases where a student has outstanding reassessment opportunities but there is no evidence to suggest that they can improve upon that award or its classification. A student may then decline that award in order to take their reassessment opportunities after which they will be issued with a new transcript once those outcomes are confirmed.
- No other body shall confer awards of the University, with the exception of honorary degrees. Where a student's award is the subject of an appeal against the decision of an Assessment Board and that appeal is upheld, the resulting award shall be conferred by the Awards Board.
- Awards Examiners present when awards are conferred shall be invited to affirm that the decisions reached by the Board have been arrived at through due regulatory process. These decisions shall be formally recorded.
- On any matter where the Awards Board cannot reach consensus, the Awards Board shall normally decide by majority vote. However, on matters of principle and at the request of Awards Examiners, the Chair may decide to refer the matter to the Academic Board.
- The Awards Board shall confer an award on a student at the end of the semester in which they become eligible. The award may only be deferred if a student has outstanding reassessments whose outcome may affect the classification awarded.

5. All Assessment Boards

- Chairs and members of the University Awards Board and Subject Standards Boards are accountable to Academic Board for the fulfilment of the terms of reference of the Awards Board and Subject Standards Boards. All matters discussed at an Assessment Board in relation to individual students, the confirmation of marks or the conferment of awards are strictly confidential. No discussion of individual results with students or staff shall take place until results have been formally ratified and published.
- Marks may be confirmed for publication through the authority of the Chair or Vice-Chair of the relevant Subject Standards Board, provided internal second marking has been carried out in accordance with these regulations and provided (for Intermediate, Honours and Masters level modules) that External Examiners have reviewed a sample of student work and commented on the appropriateness of marking standards.
- Arrangements for Assessment Boards for collaborative provision shall be consonant with the principles and processes described above. In particular all recommendations for awards shall be reported to the University Awards Board (or its Chair if the cycle of meetings requires this) for formal conferral. For operational reasons meetings to confirm results and those to review

outcomes and monitor the course may be scheduled in a single session with External Examiners invited to attend; such variations will be set out in the Memorandum of Agreement and associated documentation.

6. Delegation of responsibility for assessment

- A Subject Standards Board may delegate the tasks within its terms of reference to individual members and groups of members, subject to the requirement for confirmation of marks specified above.
- The Awards Board, at the time when it meets to confer awards, shall agree explicit arrangements for delegating any outstanding decisions to its Chair and Vice-Chair/s. Decisions taken by the Chair shall be signed by him or her and shall be notified to the Awards Examiners at the Board's next full meeting.

7. Confirmation of marking standards

- Confirmation of marking standards is one of the most important responsibilities of the Subject Standards Examiner – perhaps the most critical to the assessment process. It is explained here in the context of the four core responsibilities.
- The first responsibility of the External Examiner in the assessment cycle is to moderate the content of exam papers and other assessment components.
- The second regular responsibility is to consider samples of assessed work and advise whether the overall marking standard is appropriate; without this confirmation the module result cannot be fully published. Such sampling may take place remotely (via a posted or where approved an electronically communicated / accessed sample) or on site at the University or partner teaching institution. The examiner is asked to confirm marking standards via the University's Evision portal; in addition to the yes or no decision, commentary is welcomed and is essential where the examiner disagrees the marking standard. Commentary should be provided via the Module Confirmation Proforma which should be completed and submitted electronically.
- The third core responsibility is to contribute to the discussion at Performance Enhancement Meetings (PEMs) which are designed to review and consider improvements to modules and courses, so as to enable enhancements to the quality/standard/sustainability of modules and courses and to drive up overall performance.
- The fourth responsibility is to provide the Annual Report which is the formal opportunity to provide a clear written view on standards, to comment on strong and weak points, and to make recommendations.

8. Mitigating circumstances, exceptional coursework extensions, and appeals

- Assessment Boards (and PEMs) have no responsibility for discussing and deciding upon student claims for mitigating circumstances for non-attendance at examinations, or non-submission of coursework, or impaired academic performance in an examination. Decisions for these claims are taken outside of the SSB system by a series of panels convened for this purposes. Modification of marks is carried out by SSB secretaries, and decisions on claims are published at the same time and in the same way (i.e. via the student's Evision account) as the publication of module results.
- Requests and decisions on the granting of exceptional coursework extensions

are also subject to processes independent of SSBs.

- Similarly decisions on appeals are taken outside of the SSB system, though of necessity the outcome decision cannot be communicated until after the standard module result publication date.

9. Performance Enhancement Meetings

- PEMs are not assessment boards and have no authority to consider and make decisions regarding either the confirmation of marks for or the conferment of awards on individual students.
- However their structure directly reflects the structure of SSBs; all internal and external examiners who are members of a particular SSB are members of the equivalent PEM, and the Chair and Vice-Chair are normally the same. The key elements of outturn information considered by the PEM concern module results, course progression, and awards by course, and these all reflect SSB structure, and information is also produced and considered at overall SSB level.
- Full details concerning PEMs are in the Quality Manual.

10. Progression proposals and decisions

- Progression decisions are based on provisions of Academic Regulations. Profiles for individual students are produced by the Academic Registry and presented to senior members of academic Schools for checking and where necessary revising on behalf of the Head of School.
- The process for carrying out this checking is a matter for the school, and profiles are commonly but not always batched to SSB or a group of SSBs; however agreement of progression is not a matter for which SSBs (or indeed PEMs) are formally responsible.

11. Awards proposals

- Only the University Awards Board may make the decision to confer awards on students.
- However the process for producing the awards proposals – Academic Registry producing student profiles and presenting them to Schools for checking and annotation where necessary – is essentially the same as that for progression, the key significant difference being that outcome is not a decision but agreed profiles to be presented to the Awards Board for decision.

12. Awards Board reports

- In addition to conferring awards the Awards Board considers issues of assessment policy and reviews a range of issues which may impact on student performance.
- The Board produces and commissions a range of regular and ad hoc reports, including reports analysing student performance against performance

indicators, which include – but are not limited to – the outcomes of assessment and the maintenance of academic standards. Some reports are made to the Academic Board.

- These reports address trends – including long term trends – in student progression and performance, including comparisons between SSBs, Schools, and with national sector standards where feasible. In this way Academic Board may be assured about the maintenance of academic standards in the University.
- Awards Examiners, who are appointed at a senior level, are active participants in the annual monitoring system and in reviewing the validity / integrity of assessment and conferral processes, and recommending good practice. Periodically Awards Examiners are invited to audit particular subject areas of the University in accordance with defined terms of reference, and to include in their reports recommendations for improvement, whether applicable specifically to the subject area or of broad – including University-wide – relevance.

13. Collaborative partner taught provision meetings

- Where module results which form collaborative partner taught provision are considered at a dedicated SSB it may be possible to operate a similar model, i.e. to operate SSB mark confirmation separately from a Performance Enhancement Meeting.
- However, commonly there will be a dual purpose meeting, which successively considers and agrees mark confirmation (the assessment board role) and overall performance at module, course, SSB/PEM level (the PEM developmental role); it will normally also consider and approve progression decisions, and consider and recommend (to the University Awards Board) proposed awards.
- The timing of these meetings will reflect the academic calendar of the teaching partner institution particularly as regards teaching, assessment marking and the requirements of external moderation, and may commonly be appreciably different from the timings applicable to London Met provision. Of necessity the data used to inform PEMs will also differ in various ways, and may often be provisional rather than confirmed and checked outturn data.

5. Outline calendar of activity for external examiners

These timings apply to London Met's own on-site taught provision. Differing timings may apply to collaborative partnerships to reflect differing term and assessment dates, particularly for partner provision where PEM discussion is associated with SSB meetings.

- Start of October: Normal start date for tenure of new Subject Standards Examiners (SSE).
- Early October: Mark confirmation by SSB Chairs to confirm postgraduate dissertation and summer modules results for publication.
- From Early October to early December: SSEs are advised of the learning outcomes and assessment structure approved for each module, specifying assessment type, timing and weighting for each component. For coursework components throughout the module, proposed titles are provided for SSE comment, so that comments may be taken into account before the titles are published/confirmed to students. (If ready, proposed exam papers may also usefully be provided at this point in advance of the November deadline.)
- Mid October: University Awards Board. (Awards Examiners only.)
- Late October: London Met's Continuous Monitoring process is an ongoing cycle of key checkpoints which continue throughout the academic year. Data produced after the Awards Board in October feeds into module and course action plans, a key part of Continuous Monitoring. Data from the Awards Board allows for the Continuous Monitoring data dashboards on Business Objects to be updated at both UG and PG levels for the completion action plans at both module and course levels. This data also enables the results of summer reassessment, PG dissertations and other modules to be included in monitoring processes. No meetings are required, but – subject to it being possible to produce in time – SSEs are invited to comment at course level on full year outcomes and at module level.
- Mid - Late November: External moderation by Subject Standards Examiners of internally agreed draft exam papers for autumn semester (January) exams and their associated reassessment period exams. PEMs to consider the teaching of taught provision assessment, module performance across autumn and spring semesters and course performance data including progression and awards.
- End November: Normal end date for tenure of Subject Standards Examiners, after four years unless tenure extended.
- Mid December: Deadline for submission of Awards Examiners' Annual Reports for the previous academic year (ending with the mid-October Awards Board meeting).
- Late February: SSE consider samples of students' autumn semester work (for PG and UG 15 credit modules) and confirm marking standards.
- Early March: Mark confirmation by Subject Standards Board to confirm autumn semester module results (for PG and UG 15 credit modules) for publication. (SSB External Examiners participate)
- Mid March: University Awards Board. (Awards Examiners only)
- Late March: External moderation by SSEs of internally agreed draft exam papers for spring semester (for PG and UG 15 and 30 credit modules) and, where there is no Autumn Semester exam, reassessment period.
- Mid June: SSE consider samples of students' spring semester work (for PG and UG 15 and 30 credit modules) and confirm marking standards.
- Late June: Mark confirmation by SSB Chairs to confirm spring semester module results (for PG and UG 15 and 30 credit modules) for publication. (SSB External

Examiners participate)

- Early July: University Awards Board. (Awards Examiners only)
- End July: Deadline for submission of Annual Reports for examiners with responsibility only for taught modules completed at the end of the Spring semester, i.e. excluding summer modules and postgraduate dissertations.
- End of August: Response to External Examiners' annual reports using EE report response template ([AQD028](#)) and send copies of the responses to AQD.
- Beginning of September: Mark confirmation by SSB Chairs to confirm summer reassessment module results for publication.
- Early September: University Awards Board sub-committee for the Auditing of Taught Awards – only to confer awards arising from reassessment period. (Awards Examiners only.)
- Late September: SSEs consider samples of students' postgraduate dissertation work and confirm marking standards.
- End of September: Deadline for submission of Annual Reports for the previous academic year for examiners with responsibility for postgraduate dissertations or other summer modules.

6. Quality assurance and the role of external examiners

External Examiners play a key role in the University's quality assurance processes. The primary responsibilities are to confirm that the University's academic standards are comparable with the standards obtaining in UK higher education, to provide advice on areas for improvement, and (Awards Examiners) to confirm that the processes for calculating awards have been carried out rigorously and that awards are conferred in accordance with regulations. Examiners' main interactions include the following regular responsibilities:

- Review of examination papers and marking criteria, coursework assignments and project titles, and also the assessment schemes for modules and courses;
- review of samples of students' work and reporting on the marking standards;
- completion of an annual report which asks Subject Standards Examiners to say whether the University's academic standards are comparable with those in other UK HE institutions, and whether the standards of student performance are comparable with the standards of students on comparable courses in other institutions. This report is made available for consideration by the module leader, course leader, Chair of the relevant Subject Standards Board, Head of School, Pro-Vice-Chancellor Academic Outcomes and Vice-Chancellor, and students, and where appropriate feedback is provided to the external examiner (see Section 7 for further details);
- participation by Subject Standards Examiners in Performance Enhancement Meetings organised by Schools, separate from Subject Standards Board meetings, to consider fitness for purpose of the academic provision and longer term trends in student performance and requirements. In this way Examiners' views feed into the formal module and course monitoring and evaluation processes detailed in the Quality Manual.

In association with their prime role in confirming academic standards, external examiners may be asked to perform the following functions from time to time:

- consultation on changes to course assessment schemes and regulations through the course modifications process.
- participation on panels carrying out subject level, course and School review. External examiner reports also form part of the evidence base for such reviews.
- consultation on a module, course or School development.

In certain circumstances where attendance is required, an additional fee may be paid for such activity.

7. External examiner's annual report

As part of their contract with the University, external examiners are required to produce an annual report in a standard format. There are two formats: the Awards Examiner Annual Report and the Subject Standards Examiner Annual Report. Example.

Subject Standards External Examiners' Annual Reports should be completed [online](#) unless specific other arrangements have been made with appropriate members of AQD.

The Subject Standards Examiner's annual report is normally submitted four weeks after the SSB in late June (or after the October SSB mark confirmation meetings where responsibilities include summer modules and postgraduate dissertations) and forms an important part of the University's continuous monitoring procedures. The University undertakes continuous monitoring at module, course, Subject Standards Board, and School levels, and the external examiner's report feeds directly into this. Upon receipt in the University, the external examiner's report is placed on the University's Livelink site for consideration by relevant academics from the appropriate School and the University's senior academic management and students. Periodically reports are circulated to key players including the relevant course leaders and Head of School. If any urgent matters are identified, the Head or their representative will correspond with the external examiner to resolve the issue.

The course leader uses SSE report to assist the completion of the Course Action Plan (CAP) which addresses outcome standards, student progression and achievement. Any actions, which are required because of consideration of the External Examiner's comments, are recorded in the CAP. The CAP then feeds into the School Continuous Monitoring Statement (SCMS), which will again record actions required. Full details of the monitoring processes are specified in the [Continuous Monitoring](#) section of the Quality Manual.

The above mechanism is employed to close the feedback loop on matters raised by external examiners in their annual reports. However, it is recognised that an external examiner might identify an issue which requires more urgent attention. In such cases, the external examiner may address his/her concern directly to the Head of School, Pro Vice-Chancellor Academic Development, or the Vice-Chancellor (as appropriate).

The Awards Examiners' Annual Reports are available to the Vice-Chancellor and are key to assuring the Academic Board that standards are being maintained. Summaries consolidating all Awards Examiner Annual Reports are provided to the Academic Board.

8. External examiner fees

Fees apply equally to undergraduate (includes Foundation Courses) and postgraduate (includes Practitioner Doctorates) external examiners. Fees specified are applicable to the 2016/17 academic year, and payable on completion of the annual report at the end of the 2016/17 academic year.

The standard fee for external examiners, whether Subject Standards or Awards, whether University or collaborative, is £425. However there are particular situations where enhanced fees are payable, as specified below. Note that with the exception of the supplementary fees at D and E, fees are not cumulative.

A. Subject Standards Examiner - University or collaborative: £425

B. Special Subject Standards Examiner - University or collaborative: £500

C. Awards Examiner - University: £425

D. Supplementary fee for University Awards Examiners attending two or more University Awards Boards, paid separately for second and third board: £200

E. Supplementary fee for the University Awards Examiners for attempting meetings of the University Awards Board sub-committee (for the Auditing of Taught Awards): £75

F. Concurrent University and collaborative Examiner (both Subject Standards): £600

9. External examiner appointment process

The University makes Subject Standards external examiner appointments on the basis of a nomination form ([EEA1](#) or [EEA2](#) and curriculum vitae sponsored by the nominating School and documentary evidence of eligibility to work in the UK. The Head of School, or Head of Subject or Chari of School LTQ sign the nomination form before forwarding it to the Academic Quality and Development (AQD).

This applies equally to nominations for external examiners for courses offered in collaboration with partner institutions, having appropriately consulted the partner institutions.

Appointments are considered and confirmed by the AQD office on behalf of the University's Academic Board and Vice Chancellor.

Appointments for Subject Standards Examiners are for four years in the first instance. At the request of the Head of School, a four year term of office can be exceptionally extended to five years where a clear justification is provided. For this to happen the Head of School, or senior nominee, completes an extension form which is then submitted to AQD, who organise consideration and approval by the AQD on behalf of the University's Academic Board and Vice Chancellor.

After approval of the initial appointment or extension, AQD office generates a contract, or an extension approval, which is sent to the external examiner to form a firm contract between the University and the external examiner. Access to the Examiners' Handbook core information, [Right to Work in Uk process](#) and other briefing details will be sent to all new external examiners. Guidelines for Schools in briefing external examiners are attached as Appendix A.

All appointments may be terminated early, either at the request of either party or by mutual agreement. Fees will not be payable where contractual responsibilities have not been carried out.

10. Documentation made available to external examiners

External Examiners can access via the External Examiners [website](#) to all the general information they will need to know. Key contact in AQD are: Alam Mahbubul, Quality Manager (Curriculum & Standards) and Sheik Sohanwon, Quality Administrator (Curriculum & Standards) on: externalexaminer@londonmet.ac.uk.

In addition, the School provides information specific to the School and to the courses and modules with which the External Examiner is associated. Please see Appendix A, Guidelines for Briefing External Examiners.

11. Equality and diversity in the University

Introduction

London Metropolitan University is committed to equality of opportunity and treatment both as a provider of education and as an employer and to the production, implementation, review and monitoring of policies that promote equality for all those who study and work within the institution. London Metropolitan University values the diversity of its students and staff. It recognises that people from diverse backgrounds can bring new ideas and perceptions that help increase organisational efficiency and improve services.

The University recognises its commitments under the law. The University is committed to providing equality of opportunity by aiming to ensure that its practices and procedures follow legal requirements and good practice as recommended by: the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE); the Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC); the Disability Rights Commission (DRC); the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD); and Universities UK (UUK). It is the University's policy to treat all members of staff, students and applicants fairly and equitably regardless of gender, racial or cultural grounds, disability, age, marital status, religious beliefs, sexual orientation, trade union activity, or any other category where discrimination cannot be reasonably justified. The University will ensure that no requirement or condition will be imposed without justification that could disadvantage individuals on any of the above grounds.

The University's Commitment

The University will strive to create a positive, inclusive atmosphere, based on respect for people's differences, in which students and staff are actively encouraged to reach their full potential. All staff and students have rights and responsibilities in relation to the promotion of equality.

The governing body and all those in management and leadership roles will, through their defined responsibilities, be proactive in promoting diversity and equal opportunities, and in tackling and overcoming unlawful discrimination. The governing body will maintain an overview of the implementation of the Equality and Diversity policy and the Race Equality policy, and the Finance and Human Resources Committee will consider annually the results of monitoring.

Monitoring and Assessing Effectiveness

The University will collect, analyse and assess relevant data, in order to measure performance and effectiveness and consider how improvements could be made through the setting of targets or other action. The University is committed to effective action to eliminate all forms of unlawful discrimination.

Breaches of Policy

The University expects all staff and students to comply with this policy and will not tolerate any acts of unlawful discrimination or harassment. Any such acts will be investigated and, where appropriate, dealt with under relevant disciplinary procedures.

12. Contact details

Vice-Chancellor – Lynn Dobbs

Tower Building, 166-220 Holloway Road, London N7 8DB

The Vice-Chancellor is ultimately responsible for the University's standards and may be contacted in cases where examiners are concerned that there is a serious situation which has not been resolved at another level.

Pro Vice-Chancellor, Academic Development - Elizabeth Charman

Tower Building, 166-220 Holloway Road, London N7 8DB

May be contacted if, without good reason, Schools and departments appear to fail to act on recommendations made by examiners in their reports.

Director of Academic Quality and Development – Mandy Bentham

Tower Building, 166-220 Holloway Road, London N7 8DB

Head of Academic Quality Assurance – Katy McGowan

Tower Building, 166-220 Holloway Road, London N7 8DB

Quality Manager (Curriculum & Standards) – Alam Mahbubul

a.mahbubul@londonmet.ac.uk

Quality Administrator (Curriculum & Standards) – Sheik Sohawon

s.sohawon@londonmet.ac.uk

General enquiries at: externalexaminer@londonmet.ac.uk

Quality Manager and Administrator are the normal first point of contact on matters to do with appointments and extensions of tenure for external examiners, contracts, University EE inductions, submission of reports, fees and expenses claims, Subject Standards Board and Performance Enhancement Meetings (PEMs) schedules and invitations, and associated matters mentioned in this Handbook.

Colleagues from Schools may also be contacted directly on issues such as marking and local induction.

For University awards external examiners, the normal point of contact regarding minutes and actions arising from boards is the Awards Board Secretary - Ben Turner.

For collaborative partnerships, the arrangements for communications with external examiners and for operational issues such as samples for moderation are detailed in documentation specific to the partnership.

Senior Data and Assessment Officer - Ben Turner

b.turner@londonmet.ac.uk

Subject standards external examiners will also be in contact with board secretaries and/or the student hub, especially concerning the confirmation of marking standards, and the Senior Assessment Officer is the central point of contact for all general queries and concerns.

Appendix A, guidelines for briefing external examiners

Schools should normally provide the following materials to the external examiner prior to commencement of their duties:

- Module specifications/module handbooks.
- Course information including course handbook.
- Details of any handover arrangements reached with the outgoing external examiner.
- General information about the School.
- Any module specific information as to how the external examiner's responsibilities are to be discharged.

It is also recommended that newly appointed external examiners are invited to visit the School for an induction in person. This provides an opportunity to meet staff, to understand the aims and objectives of the course concerned, clarify queries and to discuss general matters relating to the curriculum and assessment prior to receiving their first set of proposed exams and coursework to moderate.

The Academic Quality and Development team, specifically the Quality Manager/Administrator (Curriculum and Standards) - communicates to external examiners:

- Contractual information, including the modules for which the external examiner will initially be responsible, and extensions of tenure.
- Schedule of meetings and dates when students' work will be sent out.
- Full details of specific Performance Enhancement Meetings, including times, location, and the contact details of the PEM Chair and Secretary.
- Information about key documentation and how to access it.
- Proformas, with information about how to submit them, concerning confirmation of marking standards, annual reports, fees and expenses.

Appendix B, Service levels for nominations, reports and payments

The overall aim is to provide an efficient and supportive service to Schools and External Examiners.

Nominations (and extensions and reallocations)		
User responsibility	Action for AQD and Student Journey	Timing of action / outcome
Schools provide AQD with External Examiner nominations	Notify Schools of External Examiner vacancies.	6 months before vacancy (except where tenure of previous examiner is ended with less notice) with subsequent updates as necessary
	Check due diligence, right to work in UK and any conflict of interest	Approval or rejection advised to School within 5 working days of receiving nomination
	When the nomination/extension is approved, Student Journey enter/update the record in SITS	EE receives login details to the University's system

Annual reports		
User responsibility	Action for AQD	Timing of action / outcome
External Examiners submit report within a month after the final relevant meeting of the academic year (i.e. June SSB or for summer modules and PG the October SSB). For Awards Examiners, by December.	AQD receive and log External Examiner reports, check them for quality purposes and places on Livelink.	Within 10 working days of receipt of external examiner report
School complete SSE report response template and get them approved by Head of Subject and Head of School. Send approved responses to the SSE and AQD.	Store the responses centrally./	Within four weeks of receipt of SSE report.

Fees payment		
User responsibility	Action for AQD	Timing of action / outcome

External examiners submit annual report	AQD check external examiner report, complete payroll payments form authorising fee payment and pass to Payroll Office, and enter details on database.	Fees paid by Payroll Office within 45 working days of receipt of report.
---	---	--

Expenses payment		
User responsibility	Action for AQD	Timing of action / outcome
Examiners submit completed expenses claim form with receipts.	AQD check expenses documentation, authorise and pass to Finance.	Expenses paid by Finance within 15 working days of receipt of expenses documentation.