

BEngH Civil 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		
"In my view, the threshold academic standards set for the modules/awards are appropriate."	Yes	
If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.		

Student achievement		
"In my view, students' achievement is comparable with similar course(s) or subjects in other UK institutions with which I am familiar." Please provide any further comment on the comparability of collaborative provision.	Yes	
* 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		
"In my view, the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are rigorous and fairly conducted."	Yes	
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.

I am unable to comment at this stage since this is my first year as External Examiner. My appointment was only confirmed early in the second term of the academic year 2017/18

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.			N/A *
	The Course is not currently accredited by a PSRB.		
<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 Board was conducted in a highly professional manner. Each student was given due consideration and the decisions regarding student progression/award were arrived at in a fair and equitable manner

(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.)
This is my first report as External Examiner

(c) The overall performance of the students, in relation to that of comparable levels of work in other institutions.
The progression of students to the next stage of the Course was satisfactory. The number of students referred was within the bands normal for this Course. The majority of awards made were in the first/upper second class band, with few lower second class and no thirds. This may change when the outcome of referrals is known. However, the number of first class honours degrees awarded could be questioned if professional accreditation were to be sought from the Joint Board of Moderators.

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

I have found no weaknesses that I would wish to report. I was impressed by the performance of the part-time students. This route is always challenging on a Course of this nature

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

Since I was appointed after the preparation of the assessments I was unable to comment on the drafts. I was able to review an adequate sample of examination scripts and coursework assignments and I am generally pleased with the samples provided.

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

The performance of the students would indicate that there are adequate staff and material resources provided to support the Course

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

I am not able to make any observations at this stage

(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 feedback on some modules. I am generally happy with the module content and believe that the assessment methods largely demonstrate that the learning outcomes of the modules have been met.

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

None to report.

(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.

It is too early to make any comments or observations of this nature.

(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).

Not applicable

External Examiners' Report Checklist

Please comment for all boxes

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

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

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

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?	√		
	(ii) If you did not receive all the scripts, was the method of selection satisfactory?	√		
<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?	√		
c.	Were the scripts marked in such a way to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?	√		

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

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?	√		
b.	Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?	√		

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?			√

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

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If you were new:		
(a) Did you access the on-line External Examiner Induction Module?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If not, was there a particular reason?	<input type="text"/>	
(b) Did you receive any specific induction or other support from your School?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c) Some inexperienced new examiners are formally mentored. Were you?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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:

None at present

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

--

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

--

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

--

