

## Clinical And Applied Sciences

### Undergraduate

- BIOMS BIOMS (Medical Biochemistry)(UG)
- BIOMS BIOMS (Medical Microbiology)(UG)
- BIOMS BIOMS (Molecular Biotechnology)(UG)
- BIOMS BIOMS (Pharmacological Sciences)(UG)
- BIOMS Biomedical Sciences (PW)(UG)
- BIOR1 Biomed Sci Microbio/ Molec Bio(UG)
- BIOR2 Biomed Sci Physio/ Pharm(UG)
- BIOR3 Biomed Sci Human Biology(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

--

# External Examiner's report summary

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:

The use of the VLE for external examiners has been improved.
--

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

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).

The operation and conduct of the board was appropriately performed virtually.

(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.

With the impact of COVID-19, in my view comparisons between equivalent institutions and student performance will be difficult to gauge particularly with applied no detriment policies which may differ across the sector. However, with module content and data presented, performance does not appear to have significantly deviated in comparison to equivalent institutions and observations made last year. I have viewed a range of awarded marks for assessments and module statistics suggest no particularly uncharacteristic performance.

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

Overall, the results for modules I reviewed seemed consistent compared to the last academic session. From the statistics provided, module average marks do vary so it would be valuable to review trends and determine possible developments in module delivery.

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

The modules viewed present a varied assessment approach for both laboratory and non-laboratory based teaching with case studies, presentations, posters and online assessments. I have noted that the content within assessments is generally appropriate for the level of study designed to mostly provide a summative reflection of student understanding and performance. This point should be considered with module average marks observed for the modules reviewed, since there is some disparity present derived from the statistics made available. There is also some variation with the assessment loading for modules which could be considered for the next academic session and weighting of components within. There has been a significant improvement from last year in providing content to review, although some navigation of the VLE was required. In places where feedback to students has been provided, this has been delivered thoughtfully and constructively. Although there is evidence of moderation in places, the process should be highlighted with clear details of the procedure and evidence therein. There were examples of marking schemes provided and for further development, the programme team could develop these further and introduce a standardised approach where applicable, particularly with grade boundaries and descriptors

used.

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

The module content, both theoretical and practical are supportive of the aims of the subject being delivered. Comments have been indicated in this report and with feedback to the programme team on how areas where student performance could be reviewed.

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

Module content was reviewed through My Beckett which was useful where content was accessible and organised. This should be considered good practice and continued further. However, in cases my access did not allow me to view module content but this was mostly resolved after notification.

(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.)

The module content viewed is appropriate for the curriculum covering both theoretical and practical elements of the subject area. The assessment strategy includes the development of assessing subject based and transferrable skills which are important for employability endeavours. There is good practice of employing a balance of laboratory, written and verbal tasks to give a valuable programme assessment portfolio. The module statistics point towards the successful delivery and achievement of learning outcomes but the average module pass rates should be reviewed to explore some disparity observed. An area for improvement is to make the moderation process completely visible to external examiners and to enhance marking schemes across the modules reviewed.

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

Understandably, there was no opportunity to meet with students on this occasion but in addition there was no student feedback to review.

(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.

Not applicable.

(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).

Not applicable.