

## MPLAN Planning

### 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."	✓	
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."	✓		
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."	✓	
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 is a wide range of assessment types within the programme testing different knowledge and skills of the students. Feedback is extensive, with feed-forward as well as feedback, and the now consistent use of feedback forms has improved the student experience.

## 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>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A *</b>
	✓		
If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.			

(a) The operation and conduct of the Progression and Award Board (and/or Module Board meeting you may also have attended).
The board was well run, with all issues appropriately covered. Students were treated fairly and consistently. The administrative arrangements were very good and I would like to thank the course team for making the work available online in a timely manner as well as providing me with the opportunity to meet a student and view hard copy work on the day of the board.

(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.)
A number of changes were made as a result of my comments last year. These were welcomed by myself and other external examiners. Generally these changes were to include additional information such as clarification of word counts, assessment criteria, weightings etc.

(c) The overall performance of the students, in relation to that of comparable levels of work in other institutions.
Overall the students' performance is similar to that at other institutions. At the top end, the work is of an excellent standard which was appropriately rewarded with high marks. Some students did not do as well, which is to be expected, however again the marks awarded were appropriate.

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

The students have the opportunity to develop very good design skills and there is a clear focus on design within the course. The course also has a very well developed practice focus, allowing students to develop skills that are key to planning practice.

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

Some minor adjustments to coursework briefs were made since 2017, including the substitution of a coursework for an exam. All changes were appropriate and other possible changes have been discussed with the course team (with regard to the International Field Trip assessment). Overall the standards and design of assessments were appropriate.

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

Overall the curriculum, teaching and resourcing of the programme of study is good. However, the modules drawn from the Landscape Architecture course are designed and delivered to Landscape architecture students predominantly. This impacts on the Planning students as skills are not as well developed and the 6-week substantial contact hours delivery impacts on the other modules that planning students have to take. As a result I have discussed with the course team whether there is any opportunity to make changes which will allow the planning students to develop these important skills in a different way, or in a way that does not set them at a disadvantage to other students taking the module.

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

My Beckett is used extensively by the teaching team and students.

**(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 modules within the programme are appropriate for an RTPi accredited course, the standards within a Level are consistent and learning outcomes are met both at a course and module level.

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

There is evidence of staff engagement in scholarship, research and professional practice which then feeds into teaching and assessment. With a professional course such as this such linkages are important.

**(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 comments.

**(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).**

n/a

**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><b>Recommended sample sizes at Leeds Beckett University are as follows:</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>b) Samples to include all classification categories, and it is helpful to concentrate around the boundaries to include some fails.</b></p> <p><b>c) Samples to consist of internally moderated work, clearly evidencing the moderation process.</b></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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>If you were new:</b>		
(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

---