

Leeds School Of Social Sciences

Undergraduate

- BSLT Speech & Language Therapy(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

N/A (the course for which I act as EE does not fall into the category 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

External Examiner's report summary

	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:

I have been particularly impressed by the efforts of staff to adapt assessments to COVID-19-related restrictions
--

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).

Please note that there was no face-to-face exam board meeting this year, due to COVID-19 related

restrictions. I was not invited to, and therefore did not attend, any online board meetings either, so am unable to comment.

(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.

To the extent I am able to determine, students' performance is in line with that of other speech and language therapy courses (this applies both to the undergraduate and postgraduate work I reviewed). For each assessment that I reviewed the spread of grades seemed to be within the bounds that I would expect (i.e. similar to the courses I teach on myself and other courses for which I have acted as an external examiner in the past)

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

As with other speech and language therapy courses that I am familiar with, there seems to be a considerable range of abilities within the student groups whose work I have reviewed (this point applies especially to the undergraduate work I have seen). This likely reflects, as it does elsewhere, the range of previous qualifications and practical experience that students have when they enrol. I don't think there are any particular weaknesses that would need to be addressed at course level, and am happy to confirm that I saw some very high quality work, for example in the 'Language and Cognition' module.

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

All assessments I reviewed were of sound design; the quality of marking and feedback was high, and there was ample evidence of careful internal moderation. I noted in my module report on the Clinical Analysis of Speech and Voice module that one student was given an alternative acoustics assignment in mitigation of their circumstances under the COVID-19 related lockdown. In my view this alternative task was somewhat less demanding than the standard coursework for this task, but on balance, and given the circumstances it seemed an acceptable compromise.

All students whose work I reviewed received detailed (sometimes very detailed) feedback explaining their grades in relation to the marking criteria and suggesting ways to improve their performance where necessary. I would note in this regard that the overall picture I gained from this academic cycle is of a relatively high assessment-related workload for staff.

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

Based on the assessments and module materials I reviewed I would say that the curriculum is entirely in line with the relevant professional and regulatory body requirements reflected in those assessments, and that the quality of teaching is in line with standards maintained elsewhere. I don't feel able to comment on resourcing, but would like to commend the course team for all the additional work undertaken in adapting their courses and assessments to the COVID-19 related restrictions.

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

I don't feel able to comment on this in any great detail. Most of what I have seen of (the use of) the VLE concerns the submission of assessments, marking and feedback. As far as I can ascertain the VLE seems to work fine for these purposes and staff generally seem to use it in a consistent fashion (e.g. in relation to marking rubrics). I have not become a great fan of its user interface, but all seems in line with tools and practices elsewhere.

(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.)

My comments under (f) above also apply here., and please see my comments on individual module forms for further detail. The module content is in line with relevant professional and regulatory standards and with standards elsewhere. There is clear differentiation between content taught at different levels, and I did not notice any differences in quality standards between different modules.

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

It is a little difficult to judge what might be expected under this heading. The student work I reviewed suggests that the large majority of students engage well, and this has (along with the standards of the material I have reviewed) reflects well on staff. I would also say that it is not really possible to run successful HCPC-accredited courses without a staff team that engages in teaching-related and practice-related scholarship.

(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 have no specific comments on this matter, but would note that I was happy to review and agree with the safety net provisions I was sent in May.

(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).

N/A