

MSc 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 Director.

| Standards set | | |
|--|-----|----|
| "In my view, the threshold academic standards set for the modules/awards are appropriate." | Yes | No |
| | 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." | Yes | No | N/A * |
| | Yes | | |
| Please provide any further comment on the comparability of collaborative provision. | | | |
| Note: I am a practitioner, however; based on my discussions at work with FM MSc and other graduates working for Turner & Townsend, the Leeds Beckett Courses are providing a firm base for the future employment of the students | | | |
| * 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 | No |
| | 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.

The detailed feedback to students on their early submissions on the importance of correct references helps to raise awareness of the importance of this. All papers are given accurate written feedback to help them improve and develop during the course.

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 * |
| | Yes | | |
| <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 two boards I have attended this year have been well organised, efficient and fair to students with a detailed understanding about each students situation being known by the course staff |

| (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.) |
|--|
| Not applicable as first year external |

| (c) The overall performance of the students, in relation to that of comparable levels of work in other institutions. |
|--|
| I am a practitioner so not linked to another course however, based on the exam papers and dissertations I have reviewed the standard is as good as the work produced by the Turner & Townsend staff with MSc |

| (d) The strengths and weaknesses of the students in general with respect to knowledge, conceptual grasp or application of skills. |
|---|
| <p>Strengths are ability to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider an alternative solution and test the ideas that the industry treats as given, |

- Link ideas to research and make a reasonable argument – which I may not agree with, but appreciate the depth of the research and discussion.

Weakness are possible lack of knowledge about:

- Statutory health and safety requirements, as there were a few basis errors due to lack of subject knowledge in a couple of papers but not clear if it is across the course.
- Building Information Modelling is a new area for Facilities Managers to be involved with they need to understand the principals.

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

All exam papers should be checked to comply with a standard glossary of terms that the students are aware of, in order to be sure that when a paper asks student to discuss they know what discuss means. Marked exam papers had detailed individual responses and positive guidance to help raise student standards.

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

The course leader is reviewing the content of the FM MSc course against the recently revised British Institute of Facilities Management Standards.

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

As a new user to the system I found it difficult to locate the current group of dissertations but was provided with excellent support from the course admin officer to locate the papers. The modules in My Beckett I reviewed were clear and contained situation information and guidance.

(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.)

Modules content and assessment was consistent across the different cohorts.

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

It was good to see how the coursework allowed the student to use their work environments for research and topics for papers. It will also benefit them student progress and standout in their workplaces.

(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.

At the Oct exam board a couple of student on other courses had good marks until the final dissertation and then dropped to a far lower standard than all their previous score this could indicate a change in personal situation or a lack of mentoring during the disseratation.

(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).

NA

External Examiners' Report Checklist**Please comment for all boxes**

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

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

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

| 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? | Yes | | |
| | (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? | Yes | | |
| c. | Were the scripts marked in such a way to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks? | Yes | | |

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

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

| 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? | | | N/A |

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

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

| |
|---|
| (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 |
| |
