CRC External Examiner Report

September 2026 (S3 25-26 AY)

CTU503 Practical-based Placement

Summary: As the module title suggests, reflective exercises based on work/ministry-based practice experience.

Assessment Brief: Good, clear instructions. 1500-word Critical Reflection on Experiences, 1500-word Critical Incident Reflection.

Moderation: Clear and positive signs of moderation.

Student Performance: Two students, both strong. One A grade – an excellent reflective piece. One high-B, also a strong paper but erred a little too much to the descriptive to end up in the A range (as was pointed out by the markers).

CTU505 Apologetics and Missiology

Summary: Again the ILOs are implied by the module title.

Assessment Brief: Two assessments: a 1700-word Evangelistic Tract and a 12-min Presentation. ILOs are clear. I still have a question as to whether this is actually a Missiology module? But it may be that the module content includes missiology, but it is not apparent in the assessments.

Moderation: Clear signs of good moderation.

Student Performance: Two students and they each seem able. The Tracts were both marked in the B grade and the Presentations were each awarded marks in the low A range. The marks seemed reasonable to me.

CTU514 Human Development and Discipleship

Summary: I think this module may have changed level since last year, perhaps? If so it would be interesting to know why that was the case. Really interesting assessment titles indicate and the content was engaging.

Assessment Brief: Two assessments: 12-minute Presentation and 1700-word Essay.

Student Performance: Two students (a different two): Presentations – one (highish) A grade, which I think was justified, and a low B grade, which was also merited. The research and engagement for the A-grade presentation was exceptional. Essays were marked at a low-C and a low-A, both of which seemed fair to me. The A grade paper would have benefitted from fuller scholarly engagement, but even then, it seemed to me to merit an A grade.

CTM 702 Pentecostalism and Charismatic Theology

Summary: Seems like this was a good, positive module, with clear signs of positive student engagement (esp. seen in the presentations).

Moderation: Clearly well discussed internally.

Assessment Brief: Clear brief – 15-minute Presentation (30%) and 3500-word Essay (70%).

Student Performance:

- Essay: Choice of one from three titles (re. Tongues, Theological education and Pitfalls of C/P Theology). Big class. 10 submissions – 9 Bs of different hues and 1 C. Statistically it may look like the B range is simply the default mark, but that is not the case. The C (55%) was on the poor side and that was recognised. The Bs ranged from 60% to 68% and that did seem to reflect performance fairly. All agreed.
- Presentation: On differences between Pentecostal and charismatic theology (very interesting). 12 submissions – 1 A and 11 Bs of various hues from 62%-68%. I think the marks seem fair from what I could see. I have one request about presentations.

Question: Would it be possible to see even a small sample of the presentations as mp4 files that can be watched? It is quite difficult to assess the merits of a presentation from the slides alone, so seeing the recording might be helpful for externals.

CTU704 Advanced Theological Reflection

Summary: I think it is the first time I've seen this one, but it looks like an interesting module.

Assessments: 1500-word Reflection worth 30% of total mark and a 3500-word Essay worth 70%. All clear.

Moderation: Clear signs of good moderation.

Student Performance:

- Reflective Paper: Good spread of marks – 3 As, 4 Bs and 3 Cs. Marks reflected the performance. The three As were excellent reflective papers. The 3 Cs struggled, I think, with reflection as opposed to description, but none were close to failing really.
- Essay: Again, a fair spread of marks – 2As, 4Bs, 2 Cs and a 0% Fail. The 0% was a strange one, barely coherent in places, clearly had not understood Graham, Walton and Ward. The As were both strong papers and merited their grade. The Cs were by comparison poorer, but none were close to failing and the Bs were decent papers. All fine.

General Comments

I am – as with the other boards – happy with the processes of assessment at CRC. The staff are asking good questions and setting good assessment tasks. This tends to indicate a positive T&L experience for students. I think the marking is consistent with other HEIs of which I have experience, broadly speaking, so I have no concerns.

My only question is the one raised about the possibility of viewing a sample of the presentations.

As always, thanks for organising everything in an easy and accessible manner.

Jamie Grant 10.09.26