

MEd Education 2015/16

External Examiner's report summary

Please indicate in the relevant boxes below whether you agree with the statements about the standards of Leeds Beckett University's awards, the standards of student performance and the conduct of the University's assessment processes.

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 the Faculty or nominee will be alerted and will oversee the response from the course leader.

Standards set		
	Yes	No
"In my view, the standards set for the awards are appropriate."	<input type="checkbox"/>	
If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.		

Student performance			
	Yes	No	N/A *
"In my view, the standards of student performance are comparable with similar course(s) or subjects in other UK institutions with which I am familiar."	<input type="checkbox"/>		
I have reviewed a sample of student work from the collaborative / franchise institution and in my view the standards of student performance are comparable with students studying the award(s) at Leeds Beckett.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
* Not applicable – if you are a practitioner and are not in a position to assess national standards please indicate here.			
If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.			

Conduct of processes		
	Yes	No
"In my view, the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted."	<input type="checkbox"/>	
If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.		

Areas for commendation
Any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes
The process was conducted professionally and in accordance with regulations. Good to note the extent tutors knew individual students' needs and status.

Main report

In this section you are asked to describe more fully how the University has or has not maintained academic standards and the quality of the student experience in relation to the course(s) for which you are the external examiner.

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 / franchise provision sampled.

If you are an external examiner for any of the University's Pearson Edexcel (HND/HNC level) provision, please also complete the section on page 8 sections l, m and n entitled "for External Examiners Associated with Edexcel Courses."

Professional Body Requirements			
"In my view, the professional body requirements for this course have been met. <i>*Not applicable if the course is not a professional body course please indicate here.</i>	Yes	No	N/A *
	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<i>If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.</i>			

(a) The operation and conduct of the Board of Examiners (and or Examination Committee meeting you may also have attended).

No issues, a smoothly conducted experience.

(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.)

No issues to be resolved, the RUN arrangement with Bradford now nearing an end.

(c) The overall performance of the students, in relation to that of comparable levels of work in other institutions.

Sample was a single dissertation, just students at 'refer' and 'defer' status waiting to complete, but the work viewed was comparable to other institutions.

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

As above, very small sample. The few students remaining on the scheme have, for various reasons, been unable to complete their work within the expected timeframe. As a result, developmental needs are perhaps more significant than with previously

viewed full cohorts and the work this time was sadly lacking in analysis and academic rigour.

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

The approach to assessment was again a real strength, the team provided detailed, fair and developmental feedback. As noted in previous reports from me, this is an area the team excels in.

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

Difficult to be exact, the work was at 'defer' level but not meeting the necessary learning outcomes. I'm sure, as indicated by the success of previous submissions, the candidate experienced the benefit of a rich experience but was unable to be successful at this first attempt at the dissertation.

(g) Comments on the use of X-stream (Virtual Learning Environment) within the course (if applicable).

N/A

(h) Module content, consistency of modules and module assessment across the course and the achievement of learning outcomes. (You may be asked by your Faculty to provide detailed comments on the modules that you examine.)

Only the dissertation module viewed but consistent with other work viewed over the years.

(i) Areas of good practice you have identified – please expand on the key areas for commendation listed in the summary.

Again, an area I have previously noted, the team have an appreciative understanding of individuals and their progress. Feedback reflects this knowledge and is constructive rather than critical.

(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.

The new scheme leader has quickly taken on the exacting role of liaison and all the responsibilities this entails and the regulatory framework, even with the scheme ending, remains exact.

(k) **Collaborative / Franchise Provision:** please include here any comments you wish to make on elements of collaborative / franchise provision for which you have responsibility (in addition to those you may have indicated previously in this report).

The partnership between Bradford and Leeds nears an end, a real pity from my perspective, I was always impressed by the standards and arrangements.

My role is to provide external scrutiny as part of the standards procedure for the remaining students. I have been informed there are a small number of dissertations to view and then the scheme ends, as does my appointment, this being the final academic year. The next sample will again, therefore, be inevitably small.

External Examiners' Report Checklist

Please comment for all boxes

Course Materials				
Did you receive?		Yes	No	N/A
a.	Course Handbook(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/>		
b.	Academic Regulations including any Professional Statutory Body requirements where appropriate (these may be included the Course Handbook)?	<input type="checkbox"/>		
c.	Module specifications (these may be in the Course Handbook)?	<input type="checkbox"/>		
d.	Assessment briefs/marketing criteria?	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Draft examination papers				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	(i) Did you receive all the draft papers?			<input type="checkbox"/>
	(ii) If not, was this at your request?			<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	(i) Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?			<input type="checkbox"/>
	(ii) If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			<input type="checkbox"/>

Draft coursework				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	(i) Did you receive all the draft coursework?			<input type="checkbox"/>
	(ii) If not, was this at your request?			<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	(i) Was the nature and level of the coursework appropriate?			<input type="checkbox"/>
	(ii) If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			<input type="checkbox"/>

Marking Examination Scripts				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	(i) Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts from both home and (if appropriate) collaborative / franchise partner students?			<input type="checkbox"/>
	(ii) If you did not receive all the scripts, was the method of selection satisfactory?			<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Recommended sample sizes at Leeds Beckett University are as follows:</p> <p>a) Samples should be determined by a square root of cohort size, no smaller than 6, no larger than 15. However it should be borne in mind that not all work is assessed in a way that makes a square root sample possible and allowance should be made. For example in subjects such as the performing arts where there may be a requirement for an external to come and view a performance instead, or to visit the exhibition of art work.</p> <p>b) Samples to include all classification categories, and it is helpful to concentrate around the boundaries to include some fails.</p> <p>c) Samples to consist of internally moderated work, clearly evidencing the moderation process.</p>				
b.	Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?			<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Were the scripts marked in such a way to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?			<input type="checkbox"/>

Dissertations/project reports				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>		
b.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Coursework/continuously assessed work				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	Was sufficient coursework made available to you for assessment from both home and (if appropriate) collaborative / franchise partner students?			<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?			<input type="checkbox"/>

Orals/performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct orals and/or moderate performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements?			<input type="checkbox"/>

Examination Committee/Board of Examiners				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	Were you able to attend the meetings?	<input type="checkbox"/>		
b.	Were the meetings conducted to your satisfaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>		
c.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Examination Committee/Board of Examiners?	<input type="checkbox"/>		