

School of Health And Community Studies

Undergraduate

- BSOWD Social Work (DA)
- SWKBA Social Work (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

This course provides students with the expected range of modules and placements required of qualifying social work programmes and the learning outcomes, assessment design and student outputs are of a standard expected in other institutions offering social work programmes in the UK.

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)

N/A

Areas of good practice/commendation

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

Yes there are many innovative or 'best practice' features re: this course. First of all, the team seems to work very well together and all contacts I have had from the team are collegiate, friendly and timely. The module handbooks are clear with good learning outcomes and the assessments are engaging. There are a number of assessments (law, methods and intervention) that require students to show their understanding of the knowledge base and also to apply it, encouraging students to develop higher-order skills required. There are a range of problem-based assessments. On the law course, students have the opportunity to visit a court environment or a highly innovative global issues in sw module, which appeared very engaging and unique.

The team and the practice learning unit in particular should be commended for their hard work on arranging an alternative assessment for first placement, where students were unable to continue with placement at short notice due to COVID. The consultation about these changes showed thoughtful and careful planning by a team that clearly pulled together well in a time of crisis. Well done.

All of the marking was on point across the modules that I reviewed and the feedback was supportive and constructive. The marking range was fully employed with higher marks well deserved and lower marks being used judiciously where the work had fallen short. Work at the higher end had development points provided and work at the lower end included some recognition of strengths or effort. Overall, the work I read met the standards for social work qualifying programmes.

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

External Examiner's report summary

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).

Well run. Fair and transparent decisions.

(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.

Good performance, comparable to other institutions. Marks across the range utilised by team. Have been consulted re student progress on placement where there have been concerns and team have managed these well.

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

Students in the higher range are able to demonstrate good grasp of concepts and to apply these to simulated practice situations with good ability to write in a focused way. Students in the mid-range of marking meet the learning outcomes but with occasional inaccuracies or presentation issues. Students at the lower end of the marking range usually display some grasp of the general subject area but do not back up their ideas with references or their essays become collections of thoughts which are poorly drawn together and do not address the learning outcomes. Even at the lower end of the range, the writing is acceptable and I did not review any work that was incoherent or below the expectation of written expression for the level of study.

forms of assessment.

Course contains all expected subject areas and some innovative teaching and assessment strategies, eg use of court visit on the law course or problem-based learning. Clear module handbooks with clear learning outcomes. The marking is on point and I agree with all marks awarded in the batch that I reviewed. Feedback content is personalised and supportive.

Recommendation: Team to consider consistent approach to providing feedback - some essays did not have any comment, only annotation and I am not convinced that all students click on all annotated notes. Comments box should always contain marker name and where moderation is done internally this should be noted, which occasionally was missed. I also noted that anonymous marking is not always employed and while placement or dissertation marking will usually provide clues as to the student identity, anonymity was not always in place on other assignments which I think could be problematic if an appeal could arise or in terms of transparency.

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

Solid curriculum and teaching evident from the work I read and the module handbooks. No resource issues raised with me.

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

VLE is well organised and contains expected resources.

(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 handbooks outline engaging content expected within these subject areas. There is a very clear focus on learning outcomes in the feedback and all are solid. I have supplied individual reports to the department on individual modules that I examine.

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

Team clearly work well together, evidenced in the collegiality at boards. Good partnership evident at boards with local authorities which is great in terms of student employability and shows the local partners have faith in the programmes. The team should be commended for rallying to deal with the suspension of placements for year 1 students during the COVID lockdown. The team devised a workable alternative assessment and engaged well with the challenges raised. Team members are familiar names in social work journals, research outputs and some high quality book outputs - some of which are on our booklists at my institution.

(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.

NA

(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).

NA