LEEDS BECKETT UNIVERSITY

School of Built Environment And Engineering

Postgraduate

- MSCFM Facilities Management(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

	Yes	No	N/A
"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 some good evidence of moderation and the use of pro-forma for the provision of detailed feedback is a point of good practice. In general terms the VLE is used well with a good level of materials available for students.

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).
I have not been invited to a module or progression board 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.

The overall student performance is of a good standard. The higher performing students are of a very good standard in comparison to other institutions. The good student performance overall is generally reflected in the grades awarded with a good deal of students achieving high overall results. The student work is generally appropriate to level seven studies in the UK.

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

In some instances work produced by weaker students is not at level 7, there would appear, in those cases, to be a lack of critical thinking regarding the subject materials and this comes through in assignment submissions. I would encourage the programme team to reinforce to all students, particularly new students what is expected of level 7 work. In some instances it may be appropriate for assignment briefs to be adjusted to guide students towards the requirement for and application of critical thinking. Students achieving higher grades have clearly grasped the need for critical thinking and apprasial.

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

In general terms assignment briefs are detailed and provide good information to students as to what is required and where marks will be awarded. I would like to see more consistency in relation to this (a clear breakdown of where marks will be awarded is not always provided). The use of pro-forma for feedback is welcome and ensures consistency, however I believe that when using online submissions it would be of benefit to provide direct feedback on the actual submissions as opposed to separate pro-forma. This could be by the inclusion of comments on the students work so they can see where specifically they need to improve. It is a limitation of pro-forma feedback in that specific feedback on particular items can be difficult to give. The use of the rubric function in the VLE may have with this and may reduce the workload on teaching staff (for which the pivot to online creates a significant additional workload). Exam papers are generally appropriate and I have been provided with good guidance on how they have been graded.

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

It is my first year as an external examiner on this programme, circumstances have meant that it has not been possible for me to meet students or staff to discuss overall resourcing. Given my previous comment

about the additional workload on lecturing staff due to the pivot online, this is an area I would like to explore with both staff and students through online meetings at the next opportunity.

There is not a clear place to make the following comments so I am placing it here. The overall student numbers on the programme appear low. This is a particular challenge with FM programmes in the UK and Ireland. In the Netherlands a number of FM programme are highly successful but they have also integrated Asset Management into the title to attract a wider audience. It is my understanding that the entry criteria for the programme require students to have a level 6 qualification. I wold suggest that level 5 qualification holders could be considered on a case by case basis, many people you 'end up' in FM do not come through a traditional educational route. Level 5 qualification holders could be interviewed by the programme chair and another lecturer to gauge their suitability for the programme. This may help improve numbers. In my experience students coming through this non-traditional route may be highly motivated and can be very successful.

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

VLE use is generally well developed in comparison to other similar institutions. I was generally able to navigate and see what materials had been made available to students. However there are some inconsistencies in this and I would encourage the programme team to reflect upon this. Perhaps a VLE template would help to address this (I appreciate the move online in a very short time period means this may not have been possible to achieve this year).

(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.)

I have provided module specific feedback for each of the modules I have been asked to examine directly to the school. In general the level of the modules is broadly consistent and they address the given learning outcomes. I do have a concern in small number of instances regarding the level assessments are addressing (i.e. are the assessments appropriate to level 7). I have commented on this in module feedback for the specific modules. I would encourage the programme team to reflect upon the level that assessments aim to address. This can be related by to my earlier comments about critical thinking. In my view at level 7 students should be critically evaluating, determining, demonstrating not identifying, stating or otherwise simply discussing. I think this could help student at the lower end to more fully understand what is required for level 7.

In terms of the curriculum, it is not clear if issues such as health and well-being (the well standard) along with Health, Safety and the Environment, productivity in the workplace (including issues such as 'new ways of working/ hotdesking, indoor air quality etc), resilience and adaptation, smart/intelligent buildings do not appear to be covered in any great depth. These are important emerging issues (and in some cases established issues) in the field that at MSc level should in my view be directly addressed, they also create opportunities for students to undertake research in these areas. I would encourage the programme team to reflect on these areas and how they could be integrated into the curriculum.

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

It is difficult to comment on this as I am in first year of appointment and this process is being carried out at distance. The students at the higher end appear to have significant industry experience and this offers opportunity for research by building on their MSc work. It was pleasing to see that in a couple of instances very supportive feedback was being provided to students who had struggled, this offered them encouragement. There is evidence from later assignments that this feedback and encouragement was successful as the student work improved significantly.

(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 would like to understand how instances of suspected plagiarism are addressed. There was one instance where a lecturer raised 'significant' concerns regarding suspected plagiarism in their feedback, but it is not clear to me how this was otherwise addressed.

(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