

# **CARDIFF METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY**

**ACADEMIC QUALITY AND STANDARDS BOARD : 11<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY, 2015**

**REPORT OF THE DEAN OF QUALITY & STANDARDS**

## **SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORTS FOR TAUGHT PROGRAMMES (INCLUDING COLLABORATIVE PROVISION): 2013/2014**

### **1. Introduction**

1.1 This paper presents a summary and analysis of 2013/2014 external examiner reports for the University's taught programmes including its collaborative provision. The paper notes the actions undertaken to address issues arising from external examiner reports. Key points and recommendations arising from the analysis of reports are provided for Academic Quality and Standards Board and Academic Board members to consider.

### **2. Background**

2.1 External examiner feedback is a fundamental aspect of the University's quality assurance processes and is a principal means of maintaining academic standards as well as assuring and enhancing quality. At least one external examiner is allocated to each of the University's taught programmes, including its collaborative provision. All external examiners are required to provide an annual written report (using a set pro-forma) which is returned to the Quality and Standards Unit (QSU). Each report is then forwarded by the QSU to the relevant programme director who responds directly to the external examiner (following approval of the response by the school's DDLT/ADLT, and in the case of LTDU, the Dean of L&T). External examiner feedback is considered at several levels: (i) at module and programme level (by the programme director, the programme team and student representatives as members of the Programme Committee); (ii) at School level (through an analysis prepared by the DDLT/ADLT and considered by members of the Learning and Teaching Committee, Academic Quality and Standards Board and Learning and Teaching Board); (iii) at institutional level (through a summary and analysis prepared by the Dean of Quality and Standards and the Quality and Standards Academic Co-ordinator considered by members of Academic Quality and Standards Board and Academic Board).

2.2 The analysis and discussion provided at Section 4 below presents an overview of external examiner feedback on the quality and standards of the University's taught provision within each of its five academic Schools and the LTDU. The analysis of external examiner feedback relating to collaborative provision is fully integrated into School results.

2.3 The approach taken to the summary and analysis of the 2013/2014 external examiner reports is similar in several respects to the summary report presented in 2012/2013. Firstly, as noted at 2.2 above, the report incorporates external examiner feedback on the University's programmes delivered through its collaborative arrangements with partners (although it is supplemented by an analysis of external examiner reports by each partner institution). Secondly, the 2013/2014 report seeks to present a detailed analysis of the data so that members of Academic Quality and Standards Board and Academic Board are fully informed about areas of good practice and of issues arising from the reports as well as the actions and interventions necessary to make improvements.

2.4 Some significant changes have been made to the report form in 2013-14, but where possible comparisons have been made.

### 3. Methodology

3.1 The 2013/2014 external examiner report form is structured to gather comments in five distinct areas: academic standards; assessment and feedback; programme structure/learning and teaching approaches; examination board and regulations; and quality enhancement. In addition, examiners are asked to answer a series of closed questions exploring the University's compliance with procedural matters. External examiners of programmes delivered through collaborative arrangements are asked to comment on the relationship/interaction between the University and the collaborative partner.

3.2 Initially, examiners' comments were allocated to one of three categories using a traffic light approach: (i) area of concern (red); (ii) area for consideration (amber); (iii) satisfactory or better (green). However, an initial analysis revealed that in some cases, the external examiner identified something exceptional and in other cases external examiner comments either only partially addressed a question or responses were largely irrelevant to the question asked. Therefore, two additional categories were added, namely: (iv) exceptional (gold) and (v) not applicable (neutral). Responses were collated per category and presented by School and in total.

3.3 In general, the 'best/most innovative features of programmes' and 'recommended actions' identified by external examiners focused on programme-specific and/or module-specific matters. These are considered in some detail at School and programme level (see 2.1 above). This overarching summary and analysis does not seek to replicate this level of detail but instead, aims to identify emerging themes that are likely to be of wider significance. Therefore, a detailed analysis of best/most innovative features and recommended actions has not been undertaken although prominent matters have been identified.

3.4 In total, 182 external examiner reports were analysed representing taught 'home' provision distributed across all five academic Schools and LTDU, and collaborative provision across all five Schools. Some reports related to modules within programmes while others related to whole programmes or frameworks incorporating several awards. No attempt was made to differentiate between these different settings at the analysis stage.

### 4. Analysis and discussion

#### 4.1 Academic Standards

4.1.1. *Do you consider that the threshold standards are in accordance with the FHEQ and applicable benchmark statements?*

**Table 1: Threshold Standards**

School/Unit	Area of concern	Area for consideration	Satisfactory or better	Exceptional	Comment N/A
<b>CSAD</b> <i>n = 21</i>	0	2 (10%)	15 (71%)	0	4 (19%)
<b>CSE</b> <i>n = 32</i>	0	0	32 (100%)	0	0
<b>CSHS</b> <i>n = 41</i>	0	2 (5%)	39 (95%)	0	0
<b>CSM</b> <i>n = 72</i>	0	0	63 (88%)	0	9 (12%)

<b>CSS</b> <i>n = 15</i>	0	0	13 (87%)	2 (13%)	0
<b>LTDU</b> <i>n = 1</i>	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0
<b>Total</b> <i>n = 182</i>	0	4 (2%)	163 (90%)	2 (1%)	13 (7%)

This question featured for the first time in 2013-14, therefore results cannot be compared. It is pleasing to note that 90% of external examiner reports indicate that the University's threshold standards are in accordance with the FHEQ and applicable benchmark statements. Two external examiners (CSAD and CSM) raised concerns that were not relevant to threshold standards, therefore they have been identified in section 5 (quality enhancement).

**Action:**

- Programme-specific issues are addressed at programme and School level (see programme director responses to external examiner reports, Annual Programme Review action plans and DDLT/ADLT summaries).

4.1.2. *Are the academic standards and achievement of students comparable with those in other UK higher education institutions of which you have experience?*

**Table 2: Comparability with other HEIs**

School/Unit	Area of concern	Area for consideration	Satisfactory or better	Exceptional	Comment N/A
<b>CSAD</b> <i>n = 21</i>	1 (5%)	3 (14%)	13 (62%)	4 (19%)	0
<b>CSE</b> <i>n = 32</i>	1 (3%)	0	30 (94%)	1 (3%)	0
<b>CSHS</b> <i>n = 41</i>	5 (12%)	0	32 (78%)	4 (10%)	0
<b>CSM</b> <i>n = 72</i>	5 (7%)	3 (4%)	64 (89%)	0	0
<b>CSS</b> <i>n = 15</i>	0	0	12 (80%)	3 (20%)	0
<b>LTDU</b> <i>n = 1</i>	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0
<b>Total</b> <i>n = 182</i>	12 (7%)	6 (3%)	152 (83%)	12 (7%)	0

For the purpose of clarity, this question was modified slightly from last year, which resulted in all responses being relevant to the question. The overwhelming majority of external examiners considered that programme standards and student achievement to be comparable with those at other institutions. It is positive to note that a small percentage of external examiners (7%) considered student achievement to be higher than in some Institutions. A small percentage reported occasional generous marking in a few of our collaborative partner programmes, commenting they remained within appropriate classifications.

**Action:**

- Programme Directors and where relevant, Link tutors and moderators will be asked to work closely with the collaborative partner programme teams and liaise with the external examiner concerned in order to make improvements.

- Differentiation between standards of awards and the quality of students' achievements was emphasised during the induction programme for external examiners in 2014 and will remain a feature of future induction events.

## 4.2 Assessment and Feedback

4.2.1. *Are examinations and other assessments appropriate to the level of study as a means of testing the extent to which students have achieved the learning outcomes?*

**Table 3: Achievement of learning outcomes**

School/Unit	Area of concern	Area for consideration	Satisfactory or better	Exceptional	Comment N/A
<b>CSAD</b> <i>n = 21</i>	0	2 (10%)	19 (90%)	0	0
<b>CSE</b> <i>n = 32</i>	0	2 (6%)	30 (94%)	0	0
<b>CSHS</b> <i>n = 41</i>	0	2 (5%)	39 (95%)	0	0
<b>CSM</b> <i>n = 72</i>	0	7 (10%)	65 (90%)	0	0
<b>CSS</b> <i>n = 15</i>	1 (6.5%)	3 (20%)	10 (67%)	1 (6.5%)	0
<b>LTDU</b> <i>n = 1</i>	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0
<b>Total</b> <i>n = 182</i>	1 (1%)	16 (8%)	164 (90%)	1 (1%)	0

This question was re-focussed for the 2013/2014 report form in order to help examiners provide responses of direct relevance. The overall response was significantly better than last year, with 90% of comments being categorised as satisfactory or better (compared to 48% in 2012/13). A small percentage of examiners (8%) across all schools identified some areas for consideration. Only one response has been categorised as an area of concern (CSS) and one response has been categorised as exceptional (CSS), where an examiner has commented that students have the opportunity to meet learning outcomes 'practically, theoretically, empirically and reflectively, through the assessments'.

### Action:

- One CSS external examiner commented that there is no constructive alignment between learning outcomes and assessments in four particular modules. The programme team within the school are asked to address this, monitored by the DDLT.
- Programme-specific issues are addressed at programme and School level (see programme director responses to external examiner reports, Annual Programme Review action plans and DDLT/ADLT summaries).

4.2.2. *Were assessment processes conducted rigorously and fairly?*

**Table 4: Assessment processes**

School/Unit	Area of concern	Area for consideration	Satisfactory or better	Exceptional	Comment N/A
<b>CSAD</b> <i>n = 21</i>	0	4 (19%)	17 (81%)	0	0
<b>CSE</b> <i>n = 32</i>	0	2 (6%)	30 (94%)	0	0

<b>CSHS</b> <i>n = 41</i>	0	2 (5%)	38 (93%)	0	1 (2%)
<b>CSM</b> <i>n = 72</i>	3 (4%)	5 (7%)	62 (86%)	0	2 (3%)
<b>CSS</b> <i>n = 15</i>	0	3 (20%)	10 (67%)	2 (3%)	0
<b>LTDU</b> <i>n = 1</i>	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0
<b>Total</b> <i>n = 182</i>	3 (1.5%)	16 (9%)	158 (87%)	2 (1%)	3 (1.5%)

Results for this question are much improved, with 87% in the satisfactory or better category, compared to 40% last year. Areas for consideration are halved (to 9%) where comments in the main, relate to the range of marks and a lack of consistency in the use of marking/assessment criteria. The issues identified in areas for concern (CSM) refer to overly generous marking and assignments not received by the examiner.

**Action:**

- Programme-specific issues are addressed at programme and School level (see programme director responses to external examiner reports, Annual Programme Review action plans and DDLT/ADLT summaries). Impact will be monitored following initial analysis of 2015 reports.
- Opportunities for disseminating exceptional practice across Schools (see CSS results) to be discussed by the Quality Assurance Action Group (QAAG).

4.2.3. *Was assessment feedback appropriate and effective in identifying how students need to make improvements?*

**Table 5: Assessment feedback**

School/Unit	Area of concern	Area for consideration	Satisfactory or better	Exceptional	Comment N/A
<b>CSAD</b> <i>n = 21</i>	0	4 (19%)	14 (67%)	0	3 (14%)
<b>CSE</b> <i>n = 32</i>	1 (3%)	3 (9%)	27 (85%)	1 (3%)	0
<b>CSHS</b> <i>n = 41</i>	0	1 (3%)	37 (90%)	0	3 (7%)
<b>CSM</b> <i>n = 72</i>	13 (18%)	4 (6%)	42 (58%)	0	13 (18%)
<b>CSS</b> <i>n = 15</i>	0	5 (33%)	8 (54%)	2 (13%)	0
<b>LTDU</b> <i>n = 1</i>	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0
<b>Total</b> <i>n = 182</i>	13 (7%)	17 (9%)	130 (72%)	3 (2%)	19 (10%)

Overall, results for the appropriateness and effectiveness of assessment feedback have improved this year, with 72% in the satisfactory or better category, compared to 56% last year. It is positive to note some exemplary practice in CSE and CSS. Of the fourteen reports in which areas of concern were identified it is disappointing to note that twelve relate to collaborative partner provision (SCM: EASB, AAST and CUC and CSE: SIST), ten of which are multi-programme/multi-centre submissions. Broadly, concerns relate to an inconsistency between the mark awarded and feedback provided as well as comments that lacked sufficient detail.

**Action:**

- Relevant DDLTs/ADLTs to work with programme teams, link tutors and collaborative partners, in order to address the concerns and areas for consideration.
- Discussion to take place at the QAAG to explore opportunities for sharing exceptional practice within CSE and CSS across Schools.

**4.3 Learning and Teaching**

4.3.1. *Are you satisfied with the currency of the curriculum including its relevance for employability?*

**Table 6: Currency and relevance for employability**

School/Unit	Area of concern	Area for consideration	Satisfactory or better	Exceptional	Comment N/A
<b>CSAD</b> <i>n = 21</i>	1 (5%)	3 (14%)	16 (76%)	1 (5%)	0
<b>CSE</b> <i>n = 32</i>	0	2 (6%)	28 (88%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
<b>CSHS</b> <i>n = 41</i>	1 (2.5%)	3 (7%)	34 (83%)	2 (5%)	1 (2.5%)
<b>CSM</b> <i>n = 72</i>	1 (1.5%)	6 (8%)	64 (89%)	1 (1.5%)	0
<b>CSS</b> <i>n = 15</i>	0	1 (7%)	11 (73%)	3 (20%)	0
<b>LTDU</b> <i>n = 1</i>	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0
<b>Total</b> <i>n = 182</i>	3 (2%)	15 (8%)	153 (84%)	9 (5%)	2 (1%)

This question has been tweaked and seeks to capture two pieces of information, as opposed to four, in last year's report, which led to a significant minority of examiners failing to respond to each element of the question. When merging responses falling in the 'satisfactory or better' and 'exceptional' categories, currency and relevance to employability are rated particularly highly across all schools and the LTDU (100% to 81%). Given the University's focus on employability, it is encouraging to see this positive response.

**Action:**

- Discussion to take place at the QAAG to explore opportunities for sharing exceptional practice across Schools and LTDU.

4.3.2. *Was the programme adequately resourced (staff, space, library etc)?*

**Table 7: Programme resources**

School/Unit	Area of concern	Area for consideration	Satisfactory or better	Exceptional	Comment N/A
<b>CSAD</b> <i>n = 21</i>	3 (14%)	4 (19%)	12 (57%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)
<b>CSE</b> <i>n = 32</i>	2 (6%)	8 (25%)	21 (66%)	1 (3%)	0
<b>CSHS</b> <i>n = 41</i>	4 (10%)	6 (15%)	24 (58%)	4 (10%)	3 (7%)
<b>CSM</b>	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	63 (87%)	0	5 (7%)

<i>n</i> = 72					
<b>CSS</b> <i>n</i> = 15	1 (7%)	3 (20%)	11 (73%)	0	0
<b>LTDU</b> <i>n</i> = 1	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0
<b>Total</b> <i>n</i> = 182	12 (7%)	23 (13%)	132 (72%)	6 (3%)	9 (5%)

The analysis of examiner comments relating to resources indicated that the majority (72%) of responses fall into the 'satisfactory or better' category. When the 'satisfactory or better' responses are merged with the 'exceptional' category, results ranged from 62% (CSAD) to 100% (LTDU). Although a small number of incidents are identified, it is disappointing to note that areas of concern relating to a 'lack of resources' features across all five schools.

**Action:**

- Three external examiners (CSHS) identify the need to widen access to the library, in particular for students from Bridgend. Four programmes (CSAD, CSM, CSE and CSS) are considered to be under-resourced in terms of the number of staff and three consider physical space to be an issue. School MPTs are asked to address issues that can be dealt with at school level.
- It is worthy of note that issues of space have already been escalated and solutions feature in the Estates plan.

4.3.3. *Were there appropriate examples of research-informed learning and teaching?*

**Table 8: Research-informed teaching**

School/Unit	Area of concern	Area for consideration	Satisfactory or better	Exceptional	Comment N/A
<b>CSAD</b> <i>n</i> = 21	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	17 (80%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)
<b>CSE</b> <i>n</i> = 32	0	1 (3%)	31 (97%)	0	0
<b>CSHS</b> <i>n</i> = 41	0	0	39 (95%)	0	2 (5%)
<b>CSM</b> <i>n</i> = 72	2 (3%)	6 (8%)	55 (77%)	3 (4%)	6 (8%)
<b>CSS</b> <i>n</i> = 15	0	0	12 (80%)	3 (20%)	0
<b>LTDU</b> <i>n</i> = 1	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0
<b>Total</b> <i>n</i> = 182	3 (2%)	8 (4%)	152 (84%)	8 (4%)	9 (6%)

The analysis of examiner comments relating to research-informed learning and teaching were particularly pleasing. The overwhelming majority (84%) of responses fall into the 'satisfactory or better' category. When the 'satisfactory or better' responses are merged with the 'exceptional' category, results ranged from an impressive 81% (CSM) to 100% (CSS and LTDU). Given the University's focus on employability, it is encouraging to see this positive response.

**Action:**

- The three isolated areas for concern point to limited evidence of research informed teaching (CSM: AAST and ICBT and CSAD). Programme-specific issues are to be addressed at programme and School level.

- Discussion to take place at the QAAG to explore opportunities for sharing exceptional practice across Schools and LTDU.

#### 4.4 Examination Board Procedures

4.4.1. *Have examination board procedures governing the following been undertaken in accordance with University regulations?*

**Table 9: Procedures**

Procedure	Yes	No	None at Board	EE did not attend
Mitigating Circumstances	150 (89%)	0	9 (5.5%)	9 (5.5%)
Academic integrity/misconduct (e.g. unfair practice)	152 (90%)	0	16 (10%)	
Borderline classification	160 (95%)	0	8 (5%)	

15 external examiner reports were submitted on the 2012/13 report form (CSM x 10, CSAD x 3, CSHS x 2), which did not include this question, therefore n = 168, rather than 182. The overwhelming majority of external examiners reported that examination board procedures relating to all three areas were undertaken in accordance with University regulations. It is of some concern that a small minority of external examiners reported they were unable to attend examination boards.

4.4.2. *For external examiners of collaborative provision programmes only. Please comment on the relationship/interaction between Cardiff Metropolitan University and the collaborative partner*

**Table 10: Relationship with Collaborative Partners**

School/Unit	Area of concern	Area for consideration	Satisfactory or better	Exceptional	N/A or no comment
<b>CSAD</b> <i>n = 21</i>	0	0	11 (52%)	0	10 (48%)
<b>CSE</b> <i>n = 32</i>	0	0	0	0	32 (100%)
<b>CSHS</b> <i>n = 41</i>	0	2 (5%)	10 (24%)	0	29 (71%)
<b>CSM</b> <i>n = 72</i>	1 (1%)	0	43 (60%)	0	28 (39%)
<b>CSS</b> <i>n = 15</i>	0	0	1 (7%)	0	14 (93%)
<b>LTDU</b> <i>n = 1</i>	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)
<b>Total</b> <i>n = 182</i>	1 (0.5%)	2 (1.0%)	65 (36%)	0	114 (62.5%)

Only one area of concern was identified (CSM/AAST) which referred to the consistency of information flows and need for better review procedures.

#### Action:

- This issue has been discussed and addressed through working closely with the collaborative partner concerned.



#### 4.7 School Totals

**Table 11: School Totals**

School/Unit	Area of concern	Area for consideration	Satisfactory or better	Exceptional	Comment N/A
<b>CSAD</b> <i>n = 189</i>	7 (4%)	23 (12%)	134 (71%)	7 (4%)	18 (9%)
<b>CSE</b> <i>n = 288</i>	4 (1%)	18 (6%)	229 (80%)	4 (1%)	33 (12%)
<b>CSHS</b> <i>n = 369</i>	10 (3%)	18 (5%)	292 (79%)	10 (3%)	39 (10%)
<b>CSM</b> <i>n = 648</i>	28 (4%)	33 (5%)	521 (80%)	4 (1%)	62 (10%)
<b>CSS</b> <i>n = 135</i>	2 (1%)	15 (11%)	88 (66%)	16 (12%)	14 (10%)
<b>LTDU</b> <i>n = 8</i>	0	0	6 (75%)	2 (25%)	0
<b>Total</b> <i>n = 1637</i>	51 (3%)	107 (7%)	1270 (78%)	43 (3%)	166 (9%)

The very small percentage of areas of concern identified (3%) is particularly noteworthy.

#### 4.8 Procedures

**Table 12: Procedures**

Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Blank/other
5.1 Were you provided with adequate advice as to your role, duties and responsibilities?	179 (98%)	3 (2%)	0	0
5.2 Did you receive sufficient documentation relating to the programme and/or parts of programmes (for example programme/module handbooks; programme spec)?	178 (98%)	4 (2%)	0	0
5.3 Were the arrangements for you to comment on draft examination papers and/or assignment questions appropriate?	150 (82%)	14 (8%)	18 (10%)	0
5.4 Were you provided with copies of the assessment guidance given to students, including assessment criteria?	169 (93%)	12 (7%)	0	0
5.5 Were you provided with copies of previous relevant EE reports and the response of the programme to these (only applicable in year 1 of appointment)?	58 (32%)	4 (2%)	119 (65%)	1 (1%)
5.6 Was sufficient assessed student work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	179 (98%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	0
5.7 Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory?	176 (97%)	2 (1%)	2 (1%)	2 (1%)
5.8 Did you receive a response from the programme team to actions you identified in your last report?	140 (77%)	7 (4%)	30 (16%)	5 (3%)

4.8.1 The analysis of Section 5 of the report form provides insight into areas of University procedures that worked well in the 2013-14 academic session and areas that require further development. Table 12 indicates that external examiner feedback in relation to University procedures was very positive on the whole, particularly in relation to advice about the role, the sufficiency of

programme documentation, receipt of the guidance given to students, the sufficiency of student work made available for scrutiny and administration.

4.8.2 Question 5.3: *Were the arrangements for you to comment on draft examination papers and/or assignment questions appropriate?*

The results in the yes category are much more favourable than last year (up 20 percentage points to 82)

4.8.3 Question 5.5: *Were you provided with copies of previous relevant external examiners' reports and the response of the programme to these?*

A high percentage of examiners (65%) answered N/A to this question. However, this question was only applicable to examiners in their first year of tenure and of those for whom the question was applicable, an overwhelming majority of examiners (93%) answered yes.

**Action:**

- DDLTs/ADLTs to meet and discuss with the relevant programme directors and monitor practice for 2015.

## 5. Quality Enhancement

### **External Examiner Summary of 'Best/Most Innovative Features'**

5.1 Prominent themes arising from the best/most innovative features of programmes identified by external examiners include:

- i) the diverse and innovative range of assessment methods and (where appropriate), their relevance to the professional setting;
- ii) the quality of staff, their dedication, commitment and enthusiasm;
- iii) the focus on employability;
- iv) the quality and quantity of feedback, in particular, electronically generated feedback;
- v) the relevance and currency of the curriculum.

### **External Examiner Summary of 'Recommended Actions'**

5.2 Prominent themes arising from the recommended actions identified by external examiners include:

- i) the need for consistent use of marking criteria;
- ii) the need to encourage more students to complete the self-appraisal section on assignment feed-back forms and the development of a standardised proforma;
- iii) the need to develop a more standardised approach to providing assignment feedback;.

- iv) the disparity in access to resources, particularly in relation to collaborative partners

## **6. Key Points Arising from the Analysis of External Examiner Report Forms**

- i) From the analysis of responses, it is evident that the 2013/2014 external examiner report form enabled focused information relating to the standards and quality of the University's taught programmes to be captured. Some further minor amendments have been made to the report form for 2015 completion, which should facilitate a more direct comparison and the ability to identify trends.
- ii) There are induction and training implications for external examiners to ensure the current report forms are utilised
- iii) There is a need for further staff development (targeted to specific programmes/teams), particularly in relation to consistency in the use of assessment/marketing criteria.
- iv) There is a need to develop more robust mechanisms to disseminate the 'good' and 'exceptional' practice identified by external examiners.

## **7. Recommendations**

8.1 Members are asked to comment on:

- i) the findings within the body of the report including the implications for continuing assurance of academic standards and the quality of the University's taught programmes;
- ii) the key points identified at 6 above;
- iii) the appropriateness of the summary report.