

Form 'External Examiners - School of Built Environment, Engineering and Computing' for External Examiners - School of Built Environment, Engineering and Computing

Submitted By	
Began	26 Aug 2023, 7:53 pm
Finished	9 Sep 2023, 3:39 pm
Updated	12 Sep 2023, 10:29 am
Status	External Examiners - Shared with School Last Status Change: 12 Sep 2023, 10:29 am by Kay Hartley  Status change history
Actions	Edit submission Print submission Delete submission

Page 1 of 9



Introduction

School of Built Environment, Engineering and Computing

Undergraduate

- BCEHK Civil Engineering(UG)
- BSCED Civil Eng - Design Eng (DA)(UG)
- BSCED Civil Eng - Site Mgmt (DA)(UG)
- BSCEF Civil Engineering(UG)
- CIVIL Civil Engineering(UG)
- HNDCV Civil Engineering(UG)

External Examiner ID

Name Of External Examiner:

First Name

Last Name

Collaborative Institution:

2023-06-19

Introduction

External Examiners are required by the terms of their appointment to submit an annual report. The report will be considered in depth during course annual monitoring activity. A record of the University’s responses to examiners’ reports also forms part of the documentation for this activity. It is also used in compiling our annual report on external examining.

Your report will be widely circulated and shared with Students and therefore we ask you not to refer to anyone by name or in a way that allows identification of an individual.

Please complete all sections of the report unless they are not relevant (such as you do not examine Collaborative or Degree Apprenticeship Provision). This report must be **submitted within 28 days of the main Progression and Award Board** and failure to submit within the required timescale may result in termination of your tenure as an external examiner without good reason.

NO EXAMINING FEES WILL BE PAID IF YOU FAIL TO SUBMIT YOUR ANNUAL REPORT.

Page 1 of 9

Page 2 of 9

Section A

External Examiner’s Report Summary

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](#) applicable Subject Benchmark Statements / Qualification Characteristic Statements and [Leeds Beckett University regulations](#)

If any boxes are ticked “No” the Dean of School or nominee will be alerted and will oversee the response from the Course Director.

[HK1]Added Reference to correct section of Regulations in here.

Standards set

A1) “Threshold academic standards set for the modules/courses meet the applicable national academic standards.” (required)

See 14.3.6a of regulations

Yes

Student achievement

A2) “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.” (required)

14.3.6b of regulations

Yes

A2b) Please provide any further comment on the comparability of any associated collaborative provision:

The material allocated to me for review showed that the students reached the requirements set by "QAA, UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Part A, 2014" for all provisions assigned to this external examiner. The results proposed by the associated provisions, Leeds College of Building and HKCT are comparable to those of the normal and DA provisions of Leeds Beckett University.

Conduct of processes

A3) "Processes for assessment and the determination of awards are reliable, rigorous and conducted in line with the regulations at all times." (required)

see 14.3.6c of regulations

Yes

Professional Body Requirements

A4) Do the learning outcomes and assessment of the courses allow successful students to meet the Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies criteria at the appropriate level'. (required)

see 14.3.6a of regulations

Yes

Actions from last year’s report

A5) In respect of your feedback, has any required action from last year’s report been satisfactorily responded to? (required)

N/A

Issues/point for clarity during the year

A6) Did you raise any issues/point for clarity throughout the year? (required)

Yes

A6a) Please expand below how they were/were not addressed: (required)

This external examiner did not receive access to all assignments during the first part of the academic year, and she received the assignment to review in the second part of the academic year only after the progression board. This was ascribed to the mistake in the set up of her account, so the assignments were not flowing correctly.

Areas of good practice/commendation

A7) Please outline any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features you have observed in relation to learning, teaching and assessment:

Although the results of the different provisions are comparable, some discrepancies in the organisation of the assessment and marks assignment among modules are evident. This external examiner suggested carrying out an exercise to set standards in the marking process especially when new teaching staff join the course delivery.

Section B

Academic Standards

Please advise on the Academic Standards for the Programme:

B1) Do the Courses and its modules continue to be coherent and generally up-to-date and at an appropriate level to enable students to meet the relevant aims and learning outcomes? (required)

Yes

B2) What do you believe were the strengths and weaknesses of the students in general with respect to knowledge, conceptual grasp or application of skills? (required)

The courses have aims and learning outcomes relevant to the mission of civil engineering as reported in "Joint Board of Moderators, Guidelines for Developing Degree Programmes (AHEP4), 2023 and "Engineering Council, The UK Standard for Professional Engineering Competence and Commitment (UK-SPEC), fourth edition, 2020.No noticeable weaknesses could be identified with respect to knowledge, conceptual grasp and application skills.

B3) Are the marking/grading criteria or marking schemes set at the appropriate level of study and have they been consistently applied including internal moderation processes? (required)

Yes

B4) Did students receive adequate and helpful feedback to inform their future learning? (required)

Yes

B5) In your view please indicate how well you feel the course prepares students for progression to managerial or professional employment or further study? (required)

0= not at all, 10= fully

6

B6) Please provide any further comments to indicate how the course could better prepare students for progression to managerial or professional employment or further study (if applicable)

In some modules, the presentation of some students' work was barely acceptable, but there was no evident effort to assess this aspect of the student's work, which is relevant to the engineering profession. Including clear marking criteria assessing this aspect and introducing lectures related to this aspect could raise the students' attention and better prepare them for the engineering profession.

B7) Have you had the opportunity to comment on or contribute to a review of the course including any proposed modifications or enhancements to provision? (required)

Yes

B8) If you have answered no to any of the above or would like to add any further points of clarity, please expand in the box below:

This external examiner had an exchange with the head of the award board regarding possible improvements to the course, which did not include the quality of the provisions, but only their management.

Section C

Assessment

Please advise on the Assessment Process for the Programme:

C1) The internal assessment / examination procedures are comparable with similar awards in the UK. (required)

Yes

C2) Procedures for the Exam Boards were fairly and rigorously conducted (including procedures governing extenuating circumstances, academic misconduct and borderline performance), and in accordance with the University's Academic Regulations. (required)

No

C3) The design and structure of the assessment methods used were appropriate; there was comparability within and across modules/awards in terms of level and their effectiveness in measuring the overall learning outcomes. (required)

Yes

C4) There was sufficient rigour in the achievement of learning outcomes in professional placements / work-based learning / work experience (where relevant).

Yes

C5) The moderation process is rigorous and there is consistency in marking standards. (required)

No

C6) The range of exam papers / assignments provided for sampling purposes and their appropriateness in terms of subject / level / learning outcomes were appropriate. (required)

Yes

C7) If You have answered no to any of the above or would like to add any further points of clarity, please expand in the box below:

Cases of academic misconduct were not highlighted in the exam boards, but, the cases of borderline performance were: it is unclear whether any academic misconduct occurred or was identified.
The marking standards need to be standardised across the different modules of each course. This external examiner recommended that all teaching staff of each course carry out a marking standardisation exercise at the beginning of the new academic year.

Section D

Organisation and Arrangements

Please advise on the organisation and arrangements for you undertaking this role:

D1) I was new in post this academic year. (required)

Yes

D2) The University has helped me to undertake my role effectively. (required)

No

D3) I am satisfied with the range of external examiner activities undertaken and with my involvement in assessment procedures at module level. (required)

No

D4) I am satisfied with the appropriateness and timing of information, of draft examination papers for approval and student work for moderation. (required)

No

D5) I am satisfied with the on-line induction training designed to familiarise External Examiners with the University's Regulations/Procedures concerning assessment.

Newly appointed External Examiners only

No

D6) I am satisfied with the level of support received from my mentor.

External Examiners new to the role only

No

D7) I am satisfied with the programme-level induction provided by the Course Director to familiarise me with the programme itself. (required)

No

D8) Are there any general or specific comments on the development and support offered by the University, especially improvements you would like to see:

I did not receive any induction or assigned mentor, which could have been beneficial.
A clear calendar of the different boards presented at the beginning of each semester would be beneficial.

D9) If You have answered no to any of the above or would like to add any further points of clarity, please expand in the box below:

I did not receive any induction, or assigned mentor and these could have been beneficial.
I had to send several emails to the office management and one to the course director to check whether my account as an external examiner was working correctly. They claimed there was an error in my account setup from their side.
Even the email with this report was sent to my personal email and it was in the spam folder. Moreover, on the first page of this report, it is indicated that it should submitted within 28 days from the relevant board. I attended 3 relevant progression boards but could only indicate one on the form. An email sent to the email address that I corresponded to for the moderation could have highlighted the further issue about not receiving the email correctly including the link for the external examiner report submission.
The calendar of the different boards was not presented at the beginning of the trimester.
The communication and organisation of the external examination should be improved.

Section E

Collaborative Provision

Please indicate if you have been satisfied with the following:

E) Do you examine collaborative provision?

Yes

E1) Students' performance provided evidence of access to appropriate learning resources at the Partner.

Only complete if relevant.

No

E2) The operation and management of the assessment process and Board of Examiners between the University and partner was satisfactory. (required)

Only complete if relevant.

Yes

E3) The effectiveness of arrangements in place to ensure that the standards of awards are credible and secure, irrespective of where, or how, programmes are delivered, and who delivers them. (required)

Only complete if relevant.

Yes

E4) If you have answered no to any of the above or would like to add any further points of clarity, please expand in the box below:

Collaborative provisions: Leeds College of Building and HKCT. I was provided access only to the marked and internally moderated students' work samples; hence, I cannot be sure that the students in the collaborative provision received the appropriate learning resources.

Section F

Degree Apprenticeships

F1) Were you involved in the examination of Apprenticeship Provision?

Yes

F2) Overall, were apprenticeship learners achieving and progressing in line with the requirements of the apprenticeship (either closed cohort or as part of a mixed cohort)?

If you stated 'No', to Q2, or would like to add any further points of clarity, please use the box below (Displays when No is selected)

Yes

Open comments

Section G

End Point Assessment

G1) I have seen evidence that Apprentices have the opportunity to practice the assessment methods that will be used at End Point Assessment before undertaking the End Point Assessment.

No

G2) If you examine integrated apprenticeship provision, please provide specific comments on the suitability and content of End Point Assessment:

I did not review the module linked to the End Point Assessment; however, the content of the course is aligned with the requirements for the achievement of the IEng qualification if the students had the required experience.

G3) If you have answered no to any of the above or would like to add any further points of clarity, please expand in the box below:

I did not review the module where the End Point Assessment is practised.

Where applicable, a copy of your report will be shared with the Chief External Examiner who is appointed to provide oversight of related modules and/or courses.

Final Comments

Are there any other final comments you would like to make in relation to your role as External Examiner?

The coordination of the modules should be improved. I mentioned to the Course Director that the appearance of the Blackboard pages of the different modules should be standardised, as this is beneficial to the students and the course review by the external examiners. Other procedures should be standardised, and the dates of the boards for the different provisions and the list of the modules to review should be presented at the beginning of the semester or even at the beginning of the academic year.
The communication system from the central services and the specific course should be improved.

End of Tenure Report

If you are at the end of your tenure as External Examiner, please provide an overview of the development of the programme during your term of office. This overview will be of value to the University, the programme team and to the incoming External Examiner.

Please include commentary regarding academic standards and student achievement across cohorts during the examiner's period of appointment:

This Section is only to be completed by external examiners at the end of their tenure.

Email Address (required)

Date (required)

2023-09-09

Page 9 of 9