

Title of Examination:		Mathematics and Philosophy (Parts B and C)
External Examiner Details	Title:	Dr
	Name:	Walter Dean
	Position:	Associate Professor
	Home Institution:	University of Warwick, Department of Philosophy

Please complete both Parts A and B.

Part A					
	Please (✓) as applicable*	Yes	No	N/A	
A1	Did you receive sufficient information and evidence in a timely manner to be able to carry out the role of External Examiner effectively?	✓			
A2	Are the academic standards and the achievements of students comparable with those in other UK higher education institutions of which you have experience?	✓			
A3 .	Do the threshold standards for the programme appropriately reflect the frameworks for higher education qualifications and any applicable subject benchmark statement? [Please refer to paragraph 3(c) of the Guidelines for External Examiner Reports].	√			
A4	Does the assessment process measure student achievement rigorously and fairly against the intended outcomes of the programme(s)?	✓			
A5	Is the assessment process conducted in line with the University's policies and regulations?	✓			
A6	Have issues raised in your previous reports been responded to and/or addressed to your satisfaction?			✓	

^{*} If you answer "No" to any question, please provide further comments in Part B. Further comments may also be given in Part B, if desired, if you answer "Yes" or "N/A".



Part B

B1. Academic standards

a. How do academic standards achieved by the students compare with those achieved by students at other higher education institutions of which you have experience?

The academic standards achieved by the students met or exceeded those at my own institution (Warwick) as well as others with which I am familiar.

b. Please comment on student performance and achievement across the relevant programmes or parts of programmes (those examining in joint schools are particularly asked to comment on their subject in relation to the whole award).

The students performed well overall in both Parts B and C. (There were 7 firsts in Part B and 4 in Part C.) There was no significant difference in performance between the Mathematics and Philosophy papers, with a number of students performing strongly in both subjects.

However, the marks tended to be somewhat higher in Computer Science papers than in Philosophy (with the partial exception of a logic paper).

B2. Rigour and conduct of the assessment process

Please comment on the rigour and conduct of the assessment process, including whether it ensures equity of treatment for students, and whether it has been conducted fairly and within the University's regulations and guidance.

The exam board was conducted in a fair and rigorous manner. Due consideration was given to extenuating circumstances.

B3. Issues

Are there any issues which you feel should be brought to the attention of supervising committees in the faculty/department, division or wider University?

No.

B4. Good practice and enhancement opportunities

Please comment/provide recommendations on any good practice and innovation relating to learning, teaching and assessment, and any opportunities to enhance the quality of the learning opportunities provided to students that should be noted and disseminated more widely as appropriate.

The current procedures seem to be working well.

B5. Any other comments



Please provide any other comments you may have about any aspect of the examination process. Please also use this space to address any issues specifically required by any applicable professional body. If your term of office is now concluded, please provide an overview here.

Signature:	Walts H Pean	
Date:	5 October 2015	

Please email your completed form (preferably as a word document attachment) to: external-examiners@admin.ox.ac.uk and copied to the applicable divisional contact.

Alternatively, please return a copy by post to: The Vice-Chancellor c/o Catherine Whalley, Head of Education Planning & Quality Review, Education Policy Support, University Offices, Wellington Square, Oxford OX1 2JD.