

BEngH Building Services Engineering

External Examiner’s report summary

Please indicate in the relevant boxes 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.

Standards set		
	Yes	No
“In my view, the threshold academic standards set for the modules/awards are appropriate.”	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’ achievement is comparable with similar course(s) or subjects in other UK institutions with which I am familiar.”	X		
Please provide any further comment on the comparability of collaborative provision.			
* Not applicable – if you are a practitioner and are not in a position to assess this 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 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.		

Areas of good practice
Any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to learning, teaching and assessment.
Many of the assessments are based around real world scenarios thus developing skills that the students can employ in their careers as professional Building Services Engineers. This is good practice and well administered by the Leeds team.

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			
"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 *
	X		
<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 Progression and Award Board (and/or Module Board meeting you may also have attended).
The PAB was conducted fairly and the academic regulations applied consistently. All the marks and information were available to the board and where appropriate issues were openly discussed.

(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.)
Following last year's report the team have carried out a review of the BEng programme, made some appropriate amendments and successfully gained CIBSE Accreditation. This is very pleasing to see and sets a solid foundation for the BEng programme to build upon. The BSc is an established programme which continues to perform strongly.

(c) The overall performance of the students, in relation to that of comparable levels of work in other institutions.
Overall, the students are achieving appropriate levels of work in their assessments and the programme is achieving comparable outcomes to others that I am familiar with.

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

As observed and commented upon last year, the students seem to enjoy and engage well with the technical content of the modules, but could do better in terms of use of academic writing to clearly communicate their thinking and studies. This is an issue not only effecting Leeds Beckett but one which we need to be mindful of in order to ensure that the next generation of Engineers are properly equipped to make a positive impact in what is becoming a more intellectually challenging and evidence based industry.

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

I have encouraged the team to review their assessment regime design, particularly after reviewing the AIBE franchise version of the BSc programme where it is evident that the students are overstretched with the number of assessments, to the extent that one was deliberately not submitted. I hope that by carefully reflecting upon the module, and programme, learning outcomes it will be possible to rationalise the assessment design to reduce the overall number of assessments. Please note that I did also raise this as a concern last year and it does not yet seem to have resulted in any change. I truly hope to see this feedback acted upon for the 2018-19 year and I would be happy to discuss ideas with the team if that would help.

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

The team continue to deliver a broad syllabus to the students as evidenced by the assessments, however, as the BEng is now up and running it is imperative that the laboratory facilities are established and accessible by the students for the 2018-19 year. I had the pleasure of seeing the room and hearing about the plans, and when I return next year it will be great to hear how this space has been used to benefit all, but especially the BEng students.

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

I have not yet been able to meet with the students and so I do not have first-hand feedback regarding this issue. It certainly seems to be being used effectively from what I can see but one thing that would appreciate is for the assessment feedback that is provided there to be made accessible for me as External Examiner and for QA audits. I believe that there is at least one module assessment that uses audio feedback and it is important to be able to review this.

(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.)

The BSc top up modules seem to be broadly consistent in their content and approach and I am pleased to see that the BEng modules seem to be running more successfully in 17-18 compared to their first year,

which is great to see. Last year it was noted that the BEng modules were aiming to cover too much content with depth of study suffering as a result. It is great to see that the team have reflected upon this and turned the modules around for this year's delivery.

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

The team are to be commended for gaining accreditation with the Engineering Council via the Chartered Institute of Building Services Engineers this year and for designing and commissioning new laboratory facilities to provide the necessary experiential learning. It is pleasing to see the team making the necessary steps to keep building upon their successes and I wish them well in this quest. The move to develop a Degree Apprenticeship route is also highly commendable and I hope that this is actively supported by industrial partners in the region.

(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 concerns regarding the Universities' regulatory framework.

(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).

I have submitted a separate report to cover the AIBE franchise of the BSc programme.

External Examiners' Report Checklist

Please comment for all boxes

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

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

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

Marking Examination Scripts				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	(i) Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts from both home and (if appropriate) collaborative partner students?	X		
	(ii) If you did not receive all the scripts, was the method of selection satisfactory?	X		
<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?	X		
c.	Were the scripts marked in such a way to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?	X		

Dissertations/project reports				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate?	X		
b.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?	X		

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 partner students?	X		
b.	Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?	X		

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?			X

Module Board/Progression and Award Boards				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	Were you able to attend the meetings?	X		
b.	Were the meetings conducted to your satisfaction?	X		
c.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Module Board/Progression and Award Boards?	X		

Development and support of External Examiners

Please mark the appropriate boxes:

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Were you new in post in academic year 2017/18?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

If you were new:

(a) Did you access the on-line External Examiner Induction Module?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If not, was there a particular reason?

(b) Did you receive any specific induction or other support from your School?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Some inexperienced new examiners are formally mentored. Were you?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Did you find the mentoring you received helpful?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Any general or specific comments on the development and support offered by the University, especially improvements you would like to see:

For External Examiners associated with Pearson Licensed Centre Programmes

If you are an external examiner for any of the University's Pearson provision (HND/HNC level), please complete sections (l) – (n) below to enable the University to capture the data requested by Pearson for its Annual review report.

(l) Any major issues with regard to the HND/HNC course(s) with which you are associated

NA

(m) Areas of good practice you have identified specifically relating to HND/HNC course(s) with which you are associated

NA

(n) Any other comments that you wish to make that are related specifically to the HND/HNC course(s) with which you are associated

NA