

**External Academic Adviser's Report 2022-23**

External Academic Advisers play an important role in the maintenance of academic quality and standards. The External Academic Adviser's report is an integral part of the UOWCHK’s academic monitoring and review procedures. The purpose of the report is to help the College satisfy itself that the Faculty is maintaining the international standard of the award for which it is responsible. External Academic Adviser reports should be frank and open but should avoid references to either individual staff or students. The College is not only interested to identify problems but also examples of good practice. It would therefore be helpful if you could formulate your comments with this in mind.

The report has two sections. Section 1 provides a signed assurance that the academic standard of the relevant student assessment is being maintained. Section 2 is the specific questions and External Academic Advisers are at liberty to cover any important issues.

Please return the report to the Secretariat of the Academic Board at the end of the academic year.

Thank you for your assistance.

Please return the report to the Academic Board Secretariat at the following email address:

(waichul@uow.edu.au)

**UOW College Hong Kong**

**External Academic Adviser Report**

**Section 1**

I, NAME, ***External Academic Adviser*** for:

Faculty of Science and Technology assure the Academic Board of UOW College Hong Kong that the academic standard and assessment of the courses/programme(s) in PROGRAMME that I have reviewed are being maintained at the international level for similar courses/programme(s). This assurance is ***unqualified/qualified*** \* as indicated below.

Qualifications:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| *(Signature)* |  | *(Date)* |

\* Please delete where inappropriate

Note.

* An ***unqualified*** assurance represents the EAA’s judgment that the academic standard and assessment of the courses/programme(s) are well maintained, without any identified exceptions.
* A ***qualified*** assurance indicates that academic standard and assessment of the courses/programme(s) are adequately maintained with the exception of a few issues.

**Section 2**

***A. Resources and Support***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Was the briefing provided by the Faculty adequate?
 | [ ] Yes[ ] Not entirely[ ] Not provided |
| 1. Was the assistance provided by the Faculty to enable you to fulfil your role, e.g. information on courses, delivery of materials for review etc. adequate?
 | [ ] Yes[ ] Not entirely[ ] Not provided |
| Please elaborate on your responses above and provide comment on any particular issues or areas of good practice. If you answered “Not entirely” in any questions, what improvements would you suggest?Click or tap here to enter text. |

***B. Assessment Arrangements***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Was the assessment strategy in the courses you moderated effective for the assessment of the learning outcomes?
 | [ ] Yes[ ] Not entirely |
| 1. Were the examination papers well set?
 | [ ] Yes[ ] Not entirely[ ] Not applicable |
| 1. Were the rubrics / marking schemes sufficiently clear to you?
 | [ ] Yes[ ] Not entirely[ ] Not provided |
| 1. Were the rubrics / marking schemes appropriate to the assessment?
 | [ ] Yes[ ] Not entirely |
| 1. Were students’ works graded according to the rubrics / marking schemes?
 | [ ] Yes[ ] Not entirely |
| 1. Were the rubrics / marking schemes consistently applied by markers?
 | [ ] Yes[ ] Not entirely |
| 1. For projects or dissertations, were the topics appropriate?
 | [ ] Yes[ ] Not entirely |
| Please elaborate on your responses above and provide comment on any particular issues or areas of good practice. If you answered “Not entirely” in any questions, what improvements would you suggest?Click or tap here to enter text. |

***C. Academic Standard Demanded***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Was the level of students’ knowledge, analytical skills, communication skills, intellectual skills, etc., demanded by the assessment tasks appropriate for the course / programme?
 | [ ] Yes[ ] Not entirely |
| 1. Was the academic level demanded on a par with comparable courses elsewhere?
 | [ ] Yes[ ] Not entirely |
| 1. Was the academic level demanded similar to that of previous years?
 | [ ] Yes[ ] Not entirely |
| Please elaborate on your responses above and provide comment on any particular issues or areas of good practice. If you answered “Not entirely” in any questions, what improvements would you suggest?Click or tap here to enter text. |

***D. Academic Standard Attained***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. As exhibited by the assessments, did the students’ performance demonstrate achievement of the expected standards?
 | [ ] Yes[ ] Not entirely |
| 1. Was the academic standard attained by the students on a par with comparable courses / programmes elsewhere?
 | [ ] Yes[ ] Not entirely |
| 1. Was the academic standard attained by the students on a par with that of previous years?
 | [ ] Yes[ ] Not entirely |
| 1. Did the students’ project reports or dissertations meet the expected standard?
 | [ ] Yes[ ] Not entirely[ ] Not applicable |
| Please elaborate on your responses above and provide comment on any particular issues or areas of good practice. If you answered “Not entirely” in any questions, what improvements would you suggest?Click or tap here to enter text. |

***E. Overall Comments and Suggestions***

The College would welcome your views on any relevant issues that you would like to address. In particular, you are invited to comment on the following items. You are not expected to cover all issues in each report. More elaborate remarks in the final year of your appointment term are much appreciated.

1. the curriculum design and structure
2. the appropriateness of the syllabus
3. advice on programme enhancement, including the curriculum, syllabus, teaching and learning strategies, assessment, etc.
4. good practice to be disseminated

Click or tap here to enter text.