

Leeds Business School

Undergraduate

- BAMAM Marketing and Advrtsng Mgt(UG)
- BAMKM Marketing Management(UG)
- BAMKT Marketing(UG)
- BMKAM Marketing with Advertising Mgt(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

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:

There is strong evidence of good quality supervision, student engagement and in consequence very good student learning – resulting in a healthy, academically sound learning environment. It is clear that the relationships between supervisors and students is supportive and motivational. It is particularly helpful to students to have such detailed verbal feedback via the Voice comment function and to be able to see the breakdown of grades for the dissertation components.

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.			

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).

Not attended in 2020-2021

(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.

Students had clearly engaged fully with the research processes and this led to a broad range of well researched and analytical dissertations.

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

Student engagement appears to vary within the sample seen, however, this has been a challenging year and this might explain differences in application of skills. The level of student learning is very good and it is clear that the relationships between supervisors and students is supportive and motivational.

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

Some strong evidence of good quality teaching, student engagement, highly motivated students and in consequence very good student learning – resulting in a healthy, academically sound learning environment.

Appropriate assessment mechanisms aligned to module learning outcomes which assess students' achievements in a fair and consistent manner - a clear structured approach evident.

I have no concerns regards the quality of teaching and support mechanisms employed across the spectrum of modules I reviewed.

It would be useful, however, to see greater alignment between marks awarded by the use of an assessment criteria matrix as is the case for the project presentations. This would help students determine their positioning relative to what they needed to achieve in order to gain a higher mark. It might be that an assessment matrix for the dissertation is used but I found no evidence of this framework being used. There appears to be a disconnect between the feedback given by tutors and any grading framework.

It would be good to see the Internal Moderation reports depicting the internal examiners' grades and feedback showing a succinct explanation beside any altered mark where (and if) the examiners have not

agreed with the grade.

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

There is strong evidence of a cohesive curriculum which supports the students in research strategies and techniques. This has, on the whole, been used to good effect by the majority of students. There appears to be differences between the levels of analysis and synthesis within the cohort.

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

My Beckett is used to communicate with students but, particularly in this challenging year, it might have been used more fully to support the students. I am at a disadvantage as this is my first year as external examiner and face to face discussions with the course team have not happened.

(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.)

There is cohesiveness between the dissertation planning presentations and the dissertations themselves. The feedback provided to students is clear and developmental. The verbal feedback provided to students via My Beckett is particularly detailed.

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

This is a strength, I believe, of this course. The topics chosen by the students for their research are both topical and challenging. The links to professional practice are strong in some instances.

(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.

All quality procedures appeared to have been followed. Again, I am unable to comment fully this academic year as my understanding has been somewhat limited due to the COVID-19 restrictions and adjustments.

(k) Collaborative Provision: please include here any comments you wish to make on elements of

previously in this report).

n/a