

Name	Professor Monica Greco		
Home Institution	Goldsmiths, University of London		
Email Address	m.greco@gold.ac.uk		
Name(s) of course(s) examined <i>e.g. Tripos Part/ MPhil/ MRes</i>	MPhil Health, Medicine and Society		
Academic year of examination	2022/23		
Level ( <i>Delete as appropriate</i> )		Postgraduate	
Year of Appointment	3rd		

	Yes	No	N/A
1. Are the academic standards set for the award appropriate for the qualification, and comparable with similar programmes in other UK institutions?	x		
2. Are you satisfied that you received sufficient programme materials (handbooks, regulations, marking and classing criteria) in a timely manner?		x	
3. Are you satisfied that you were consulted adequately on draft examination papers, and that your comments and suggestions were taken into consideration?			x
4. Are you satisfied that the assessment was pitched at the appropriate level?	x		
5. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?	x		
6. Do the assessment processes measure student achievement rigorously and fairly against the intended outcomes of the programme?	x		
7. Are you satisfied that issues raised on your previous report form have been properly considered and, where applicable, acted upon?			x
8. Did you receive a written response from the Department to your previous report form?			x

If you replied No to any of the questions above, please expand here:

This year the assessment process for this programme was affected by the marking and assessment boycott (MAB), as has been the case for many programmes in other universities. For this reason the programme materials were sent to me uncharacteristically late, and with extremely tight turnaround times in the case of a few scripts. I should stress that this has not been a problem in the past and I do not expect it to be a problem again, under normal circumstances.

Do you have any concerns about the course, including standards and quality?

No

Are you satisfied that the procedures associated with the assessment are efficient (e.g. timeframes, draft papers, questions, design and conduct of exam, meetings, vivas)?

Yes

Do you have any comments on marking and classing (e.g. range of marks, action around borderline marks, penalties, moderation, double marking, reconciliation of marks)?

I reviewed essays and dissertations identified as having low marks or high marks; those where examiners had given widely divergent marks or marks across a class boundary; and a sample of manuscripts with mid-range marks. In total I reviewed 8 Essays (two from the Essay 2 batch, 6 from the Essay 3 batch) and 8 Dissertations.

Based on the scripts I have reviewed, the internal marking process has been conducted appropriately, consistently, and fairly. The full range of marks was used by assessors, including an exceptionally high mark of 90 by the first assessor of one of the dissertations. The extensive comments provided on each of the manuscripts clearly justified the mark given by assessors, and where there was a large discrepancy they provided insights into how this was resolved.

Do you have any comments on the student experience of the course and/or their experience of the assessment process?

I have not had access to any student feedback that would enable me to comment on this.

Do you have any comments on University policies (e.g. the role of the external examiner, policies around plagiarism, script annotation)?

No

Please describe here any recommendations for improvement.

As discussed during the final Examiners' meeting, I found the categorisation of students into disciplines (as this appeared on the marksheet) often did not correspond to the disciplinary orientation of the work produced. This was confusing to me and I wondered if it might also be confusing for assessors. The Senior Examiner provided a useful clarification regarding how categorisation on the marksheet should be interpreted, but I wonder if a better system could be devised to avoid such confusion in future.

Please highlight any good practice you encountered.

Overall I was impressed by both the range and the quality of the work I reviewed. I was also impressed by the quality of feedback provided to candidates on each of their submissions, which typically included a full justification of any reservations and constructive suggestions for improvement. I have not reviewed the feedback provided by every assessor on every manuscript so I cannot comment on whether the same quality of feedback is provided consistently throughout, but it was certainly evident in the samples I examined and it should be commended.

The multi- and inter-disciplinary character of the programme means that assessment of the quality of a manuscript is not always as straight-forward as it might otherwise be (the different ways in which 'ethnography' can be interpreted in the context of e.g. anthropology vs sociology – and whether a piece of research constitutes good 'ethnography' – is a case in point). I was pleased to see that there is explicit and careful reflexivity on this matter among assessors.

Have you seen any evidence of grade inflation?

No.

If this is your final year as external examiner? If so, have you seen improvements over your tenure? Has the Department acted on your advice?

N/A

Do you have any other comments?

It has been once again a pleasure to read the often excellent work produced by candidates on this programme and to engage with the assessment process, which is conducted with exemplary thoroughness and care.



Thank you for completing the External Examiner Report form.

**Please now forward to [vcexternalexaminers@admin.cam.ac.uk](mailto:vcexternalexaminers@admin.cam.ac.uk) by July 31<sup>st</sup> for undergraduate examinations, 1<sup>st</sup> October for Masters Degrees, and 12<sup>th</sup> October for resits.**

Please also forward a copy to your Chair of Examiners.