# School of Art, Architecture and Design

## Postgraduate

- MAUDE Urban Design(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)**

| |
|---|
| N/A |

### Areas of good practice/commendation

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

| |
|---|
| The course is exceptionally well lead by the programme leader and the course team under the Head of School. Students produce excellent work and a varied level of work. The excellent teaching supports them to develop their own thinking and ambitious urban design projects. The course changes approach allow a more cohesive programme. Excellent studio brief and research modules I thought they were really exceptional. |

### 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 courseplease 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). |
|---|

Fine

(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.

Great work

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

The weaker students that needed more support have an impact on time for the teaching core team and also the Programme Leader, in order to support them I strongly advice the University to keep the core team in both research and studio, and give more time to the Programme Leader to lead and organise the programme so the weaker students have support

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

great

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

Resources on the set up need careful consideration. The core team needs to be kept. The Programme Leader teaches across Module Leading too many modules around4-5 on top of leading the programme. This is an onerous task and I will advise the University to allow the programme leader to do less teaching around 2-3 modules maximum so he/she is free to lead the programme and organise it. I appreciate that a lot of these tasks take a long time and this needs to be appreciated by the University. I also advise to keep the core architecture team in place to allow quality of teaching and the planning staff to give multidisciplinary approach as this is RTPI course. I also advice the University to keep staff time for research time allowance for core staff to allow to retain high quality research led teaching so important in the quality of the course an attraction of students.

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

Staff Head and all team give great support to the students

(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.)

excellent

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

excellent

(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 core team needs to be kept. The Programme Leader teaches across Module Leading too many modules around4-5 on top of leading the programme. This is an onerous task and I will advise the University to allow the programme leader to do less teaching around 2-3 modules maximum so he/she is free to lead the programme and organise it. I appreciate that a lot of these tasks take a long time and this needs to be appreciated by the University. I also advise to keep the core architecture team in place to allow quality of teaching and the planning staff to give multidisciplinary approach as this is RTPI course. I also advice the University to keep staff time for research time allowance for core staff to allow to retain high quality research led teaching so important in the quality of the course an attraction of students.

(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).

excellent