

## Clinical And Applied Sciences

### Postgraduate

- MIBIO Biomedical Sciences(TP)
- MSABR Applied Biomedicl Sci Research(TP)
- MSBIS Biomedical Science(TP)
- MSMBC Medical Biochemistry(TP)
- MSMBL Medical Microbiology(TP)

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

--

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:

Modules reviewed have a varied spread of assessments.

## 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. The pass rate should be reviewed for the modules examined to explore some of the higher module failure figures reported.

(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 including as examples a case study, portfolio and online assessment. I have noted that the content within assessments is appropriate for the level of study designed to mostly provide a summative reflection of student understanding and performance. This point should be considered with the pass rates observed for the modules reviewed, since there is some disparity present derived from the statistics made available. There has been a significant improvement from last year in providing content to review, but some navigation of the VLE was required. Although there is evidence of moderation in places, the process should be highlighted with clear details of the procedure and evidence therein.

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

The modules reviewed appear to be conducive in supporting the overall curriculum of study. As with other laboratory based programmes across the sector, laboratory resources were withdrawn due to COVID-19 and appropriate adjustments were made.

(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. Interesting approaches include understanding scientific communication contextualised to the specialist and lay audience whilst maintaining critical skills in generating findings, analysing the data and application. There is good practice of employing a balance of laboratory and written tasks to build an assessment portfolio as well as online based examinations. The module statistics point towards the successful delivery and achievement of learning outcomes but the 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.

(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.

