

BScH Building Services Engineering - AIBE

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.
There are again some good examples of student feedback to help them improve their performance.

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 virtual/SKYPE 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. There were problems hearing the AIBE team again (for the third year running) and it would be good for AIBE to invest in better Audio Visual equipment to improve the intelligibility for next year.

(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.)
In last year’s report, I asked the team to consider focusing more effort on helping students consistently apply referencing. This still seems to be an issue as I saw variable referencing practice from students, ranging from very good practice from some, to no effort made by others, yet there was hardly any student feedback about this issue within the retained samples. I really would like to see this issue addressed and improved please as it is an important aspect of academic writing.

(c) The overall performance of the students, in relation to that of comparable levels of work in other institutions.
The marks awarded to the AIBE students is, in my opinion, comparable to those awarded in the UK. I am again concerned that few students are excelling with no first class degrees awarded, and this may well indicate a problem with the programme and its delivery. It was noted this year that most students simply opted not to submit one of the coursework’s for the Air-Conditioning & Refrigeration System (16188) module and the AIBE team confirmed that this was due to the students being unable to find the time. As

verbally fed back at the exam board, I recommend that the Leeds and AIBE teams review the assessment design across the programme, and especially 16188, with the aim of reducing the overall number of assessments whilst still testing the module learning outcomes. The deliberate inclusion of opportunities to provide formative feedback is also encouraged, to help the students understand exactly what is required and how they can improve. I hope to see some students performing at a first class level next year.

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

The students are generally talented with numerical based work and in their understanding of HVAC systems and their design. As commented in box (b) it is the area of academic writing where the largest gains could be made.

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

In part (c) I have encouraged the team to review their assessment regime design with the aim of improving the overall student engagement and performance.

Further to the comments above it would be wise to consider i/ the length and complexity of exam questions (some seem rather long), and ii/ the interlinking of parts of exam questions i.e. if a student makes a mistake in part a) this should not prevent them from succeeding in parts b) and c).

Generally, the standard and clarity of exam marking is good but I found a lack of clarity in the marking for module Building Services Systems (14169). It would be good to see the best practice applied across all tutors/modules.

Finally, there were issues with one of the questions for module Air-Conditioning & Refrigeration System (16188). Namely, the question and its marking scheme was not approved by me due to errors and problems, and in reflection I consider the question to be simply too complex and time consuming. None of the students achieved more than 8 marks of out of 25 and so, at my recommendation, the marks for this question were removed from the calculation of the exam mark. To avoid this occurring again please provide me with the marking scheme as well as the exam paper so that I can carry out the external moderation effectively, and ensure that the exam that is externally approved is the version that is sat by the students.

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

I did not observe any issues in this area and as far as I could observe from the students work it appears that the resourcing and delivery of the programme was as intended.

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

I feel unable to comment on this aspect of the report as I didn't have the opportunity to see or review the

use of X-stream on this franchise programme.

(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 to assessment. They are enabling students to demonstrate their achievement with the module learning outcomes.

(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. Other than this, I have very limited contact with the teaching team and so I don't feel able to answer this question.

(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).

This report is specifically for 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?	Mainly		
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
