

BScH Facilities Management

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 leader.

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.

The delivery providing a mixed between online material, live lectures and communications is a definite strength and a demonstration that such an approach is very beneficial for distance learning students.

Applicability of the learning in the workplace, while keeping a high level of academic standard.

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.	Yes	No	N/A *
<i>*Not applicable if the course is not a professional body course please indicate here.</i>			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 Board of Examiners (and or Examination Committee meeting you may also have attended).
I attended the meeting on the 2nd March 2018 and the event was very well prepared and professionally conducted. The event on the 14th June 2018 would be as good as in March.

(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.)
Although there was no action as such, it is appreciated that the students' referencing standard showed an improvement from last year

(c) The overall performance of the students, in relation to that of comparable levels of work in other institutions.
The performance of students is comparable to those in other institutions at the same level

(d) The strengths and weaknesses of the students in general with respect to knowledge, conceptual grasp or application of skills.
Strengths:
The level of submission in terms of writing critical thinking and research skill is

commendable.

In most case showing an understanding of using academic skill in a workplace situation

Weaknesses:

Approach to the academic challenge as a workplace task.

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

The assessment structure is well define and challenging the students at the require level. Marking is performed in accordance to the marking schemes provided and clear evidences of second marking are presented.

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

The programme shows a balance between the required academic standards and professional expertise required to engage distance learners in the workplace. The students are challenged through the curriculum to apply academic skills, such as research skills and critical thinking, to relevant professional challenges that they face at work.

(g) Comments on the use of X-stream (Virtual Learning Environment) within the course (if applicable).

The use of the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) in the programme is commendable and showing good practice on how to tackle the issues engaging and motivating distance learning students. A wide range of tools is used to achieve it, such as video lectures, documents and communication. All these tools completing each other to achieve a very good outcome on student experience.

The approach taking with the VLE is definitely best practice and it should be showcase across the university and wider audience to show what it can be achieved.

(h) Module content, consistency of modules and module assessment across the course and the achievement of learning outcomes. (You may be asked by your Faculty to provide detailed comments on the modules that you examine.)

The module content and assessment align very well with the learning outcomes for the module. Furthermore, the alignment between academic and professional skills in the module provide a good learning platform.

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

professional practice.

The engagement between student/staff is probably the most relevant fact for the achievement of good student experience and results. The students have the opportunity to communicate synchronous (live lectures) and asynchronous (email, VLE) providing a wide range of engagement with the students.

(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.

No concerns

(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)?	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?			
b.	(i) Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?			X
	(ii) If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			
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?			
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

Examination Committee/Board of Examiners				
		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 Examination Committee/Board of Examiners?	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 2016/17?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you were new:

(a) Did you attend a University external examiner development session during the 2016/17 academic year?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

If not, was there a particular reason?

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

If not, was there a particular reason?

(c) Did you receive any specific induction or other support from your School or Faculty?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

(d) Some inexperienced new examiners are formally mentored. Were you?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

(e) Did you find the mentoring you received helpful?	<input checked="" 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:

The induction session was very useful but it was clear from it the experience of external examiners was quite different depending on the Faculty. Maybe having different session according to Faculty may improve the induction.