

Private Bag X6001, Potchefstroom  
South Africa 2520

Tel: 018 299-1111/2222  
Web: <http://www.nwu.ac.za>

**NWU School of Business & Governance**  
Tel: 0182991419  
Email: [antonett.visagie@nwu.ac.za](mailto:antonett.visagie@nwu.ac.za)  
12 November 2020

## POTCHEFSTROOM BUSINESS SCHOOL: EXTERNAL MODERATOR'S REPORT

|                           |                      |
|---------------------------|----------------------|
| <b>1.1.1 MODULE TITLE</b> | Research Methodology |
| <b>MODULE CODE</b>        | MBAA 874             |
| <b>EXTERNAL MODERATOR</b> | Dr Vannie Naido      |

### A. SYLLABUS

1. Is the syllabus adequately and appropriately covered by the learning content?

| YES | NO |
|-----|----|
| x   |    |

If 'No', why not? \_\_\_\_\_

2. Does the syllabus (by means of outcomes) address the required management skills?

| YES | NO |
|-----|----|
| x   |    |

If 'No', why not? \_\_\_\_\_

3. Is the required learning content adequately addressed by the prescribed book w.r.t.:

- Conceptual approach?
- Examples?
- Exercises?

| YES | NO |
|-----|----|
| x   |    |
| YES | NO |
| x   |    |
| YES | NO |
| x   |    |

If 'No', why not? \_\_\_\_\_

## B. EXAMINATION PAPER

1. Were the module outcomes adequately evaluated by the:

- topics covered in the paper (specific outcomes)?
- type of questions set (critical outcomes)?

|          |    |
|----------|----|
| YES<br>x | NO |
| YES<br>x | NO |

If 'No', why not? \_\_\_\_\_

2. Did the paper, as a whole, cover the syllabus adequately?

|          |    |
|----------|----|
| YES<br>x | NO |
|----------|----|

If 'No', why not? \_\_\_\_\_

3. Were marks allocated on a fair basis as to the importance of the specific topic and time allowed?

|          |    |
|----------|----|
| YES<br>x | NO |
|----------|----|

If 'No', why not? \_\_\_\_\_

4. Was the standard of the questions:

- In accordance with expected outcomes?
- Well formulated with measurable action words?
- Of acceptable international standard?

|          |    |
|----------|----|
| YES<br>x | NO |
| YES<br>x | NO |
| YES<br>x | NO |

If 'No', why not? \_\_\_\_\_

5. Did the assignments (standard and frequency) comply with the outcomes and contribute (add value) to the overall achievement of the outcomes?

| YES | NO |
|-----|----|
| X   |    |

If 'No', any recommendation? \_\_\_\_\_

## C. MARKING

1. Were marks awarded:

- consistently?
- according to the marks memorandum?
- for acceptable alternative answers in open-ended questions?

|          |    |
|----------|----|
| YES<br>x | NO |
| YES<br>x | NO |
| YES<br>X | NO |

If 'No', why not? \_\_\_\_\_

2. Was the marking of an acceptable standard?

| YES | NO |
|-----|----|
| X   |    |

If 'No', any recommendation? \_\_\_\_\_

## GENERAL

Any remarks not covered by the above?

Fair and consistent marking applied.

---

---

---

/mb/Anet-External Moderators Report/2008-09-08