

School of Built Environment And Engineering

Undergraduate

- ARCHT Architectural Technology(UG)
- BSATN Architectural Technology(UG)

Please indicate, below, whether you agree with the statements about the threshold standards of Leeds Beckett University's awards, student achievement and the conduct of the University's assessment processes, using as a reference the framework for higher education qualifications and applicable Subject Benchmark Statements / Qualification Characteristic Statements. Please also list any shortcomings and areas for commendation. You should expand on any issues you mention here in the main report. If any boxes are ticked "No" the Dean of School or nominee will be alerted and will oversee the response from the Course Director.

Please also list any shortcomings and areas for commendation. You should expand on any issues you mention here in the main report. If any boxes are ticked "No" the Dean of School or nominee will be alerted and will oversee the response from the Course Director.

Standards Set

	Yes	No
"In my view, the threshold academic standards set for the modules/awards meet with the requirements of the relevant National Qualifications Statement's."	X	

If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short:

Student achievement

	Yes	No	N/A*
"In my view, students' who have been awarded qualifications have had the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in course(s) or subjects in other UK institutions with which I am familiar." *Not applicable – if you are a practitioner and are not in a position to assess this statement, please note here:	X		

Please provide any further comment on the comparability of collaborative provision

I am reviewing the following modules for RBS: Design and Specification 3, Architectural Detailing, Architectural Practice modules, Interprofessional Studies and for Conservation Adaptation and Refurbishment. I can confirm that I am happy with the moderation process.

However, there are some adjustments that needs to be made in the markings and expectation in relation to students' marks, works and quality on some of the modules especially in relation to modules such as Design and Spec 3 and the Architectural Detailing. It will be useful for RBS teaching team to be given the chance to review past students work from Leeds Beckett University to ensure that the work produced meets the

External Examiner's report summary

expectation and requirements.

It will also be useful to provide a set of standard marking criteria and requirements between modules run in Leeds Beckett University and RBS to ensure that the quality of students work and marks are streamlined.

If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short:

Conduct of process

	Yes	No
"In my view, the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are reliable, rigorous and fairly conducted."	X	

If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short:

Actions from last year's report

(This will not be relevant if you are examining for the first time)

Yes

Areas of good practice/commendation

Any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to learning, teaching and assessment:

Teaching team have provided very thorough feedback to students for improvement and encouragement. There is clear evidence of very good support as well as very good moderation process.

Main report

In this section you are asked to describe more fully how the University has or has not maintained threshold academic standards and the quality of the student experience in relation to the course(s) for which you are the external examiner, using as a reference the framework for higher education qualifications and applicable Subject Benchmark Statements / Qualification Characteristic Statements.

Please complete all sections of the form fully and where not applicable please state N/A. Where applicable please also complete the sections for any collaborative provision sampled.

If you are an external examiner for any of the University's Pearson Licensed Centre Programmes (HND/HNC level) provision, please also complete the section on page 9 sections l, m and n entitled "for External Examiners Associated with Pearson Licensed Centre Programmes."

Professional Body Requirements

	Yes	No	N/A*
"In my view, the professional body requirements for this course have been met."	X		

External Examiner's report summary

*Not applicable if the course is not a professional body course please indicate here.

If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.

(a) The operation and conduct of the Progression and Award Board (and/or Module Board meeting you may also have attended).

Meetings I have attended have been carried out efficiently and to my satisfaction and I am satisfied with all the recommendations of the Module Board/Progression and Award Boards.

(b) The action, if any was required, taken in response to your report of last year. (This will not be relevant if you are examining for the first time.)

(c) The overall performance of the students, in relation to that of comparable levels of work in other institutions.

The work of students are of good standards and comparable to other institutions I have been associated with.

(d) The strengths and weaknesses of the students in general with respect to knowledge, conceptual grasp or application of skills.

Students have demonstrated their understanding and meeting the learning outcomes set for the course. I also would like to say well done for them for getting through the finishing line, it takes a lot of dedication and hardwork to get to this point especially in such a challenging time.

(e) The standards of the structure, organisation, design and marking of all examination papers and/or other forms of assessment.

There has been good range of mark with clear marking criteria and assessor's feedback to students.

(f) The curriculum, teaching or resourcing of the programme of study as indicated by the performance of the students in the assessment

Quality of students work generally is good but it would be useful to re-iterate to students that they need to make sure that they referenced their work clearly using the appropriate referencing system and also on critical thinking and analysis.

(g) Comments on the use of My Beckett (Virtual Learning Environment) within the course (if applicable).

The Virtual learning environment is very good and clear and it's very helpful.

I have also noted the use of MS Teams to support delivery and create a forum to provide formative feedback. Which is a positive and best practice. Digital inking tools has been featured in the provision of feedback and I consider this approach to be highly effective in supporting students in the development of design-based work. It can work equally well with face-to-face and distance learning students at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels.

The redevelopment of the Architectural Technology Studio will dovetail with the use of Office 365 applications and digital inking tools. The large format digital touch screens will enable feedback to be given in person and recorded in exactly the same manner as it would remotely. It is positive that staff are being provided with Microsoft Surfaces to facilitate digital feedback on design work remotely and enhance the delivery of teaching through integration with the infrastructure that is being installed within the Studio space. These initiatives extend the boundaries of the studio environment, breaks down the barriers of physical space constraints, and enhances learning.

I understand from discussion with the Course Director that the University is planning to release MS Stream to facilitate teaching and learning. If this was in place for the start of the next academic year it would resolve the issues currently experienced by both students and staff in the recording and dissemination of presentations, otherwise Panopto can also be used.

(h) Module content, consistency of modules and module assessment across the course and the achievement of learning outcomes. (You may be asked by your School to provide detailed comments on the modules that you examine.)

Module content and assessment have been consistent throughout the modules I've reviewed. The review of Technical Design Project 1 is not a requirement of the External Examiner moderation process as it is a Level 4 module. However, I have discussed the module further with the Course Director to explore how the rollout of the new course structure is working. It is clear from the student work assessed that the module is having the desired effect and students are gaining an excellent introduction to technical building design.

This academic year will be the final delivery of the modules Architectural Detailing Principles and Design Studio 2 and the 2020/21 academic year will be the last time Design Studio 3 will be studied. The effectiveness of the new Technical Design Project 1 module needs to be built upon by the new modules at Levels 5 and 6 that are being developed.

The formative peer review of design work in the modules Design Studio 2 and 3 is a positive attribute that is to be encouraged for incorporation within the new modules Technical Design Project 2 and 3 as they roll out. Aligning this learning opportunity with the crits is an effective solution.

(i) Areas of student/staff engagement in teaching and learning, scholarship, research or professional practice.

External Examiner's report summary

The Course Team has worked hard during a difficult time to support students and this can be seen by the information made available for inspection in MS Teams and that presented during our discussion.

The proposal to move to a trimester arrangement for the 2020/21 has the potential to increase the burden on staff for an extended period. Careful management of deployment is required to ensure that staff are not overloaded and burn out

(j) The University welcomes external examiners' comments on its academic regulatory framework. Such comments may not have a direct bearing on standards set and achieved or the conduct of processes and so it may not be appropriate to include them elsewhere in this report or its summary. Please record any concerns or comments you may have here.

I am happy with the Academic Regulatory Framework. No additional comment or concern regarding this.

(k) Collaborative Provision: please include here any comments you wish to make on elements of collaborative provision for which you have responsibility (in addition to those you may have indicated previously in this report).

RBS:

First of all, well done for getting to the finishing line in such a challenging time especially with the COVID19 crisis, it takes a lot of commitment and hardwork from both students and teaching team

I am reviewing the following modules for RBS: Design and Specification 3, Architectural Detailing, Architectural Practice modules, Interprofessional Studies and for Conservation Adaptation and Refurbishment. I can confirm that I am happy with the moderation process.

However, there are some adjustments that needs to be made in the markings and expectation in relation to students' marks, works and quality on some of the modules especially in relation to modules such as Design and Spec 3 and the Architectural Detailing. It will be useful for RBS teaching team to be given the chance to review past students work from Leeds Beckett University to ensure that the work produced meets the expectation and requirements.

It will also be useful to provide a set of standard marking criteria and requirements between modules run in Leeds Beckett University and RBS to ensure that the quality of students work and marks are streamlined.