

MSc Quantity Surveying Commercial Management 2017/18

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. |
| Good level of marking observed (which secondary reviews) and some in depth commentary around the coursework in particular. Online monitoring of students is effective and gives clarity around usage/time spent etc. |

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). |
| Professional and efficient. All grade positions confirmed clearly and efficiently. |

| |
|---|
| (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.) |
| Last years comments were about consistency of approach and marking schemes. This has again been noted and is a work in progress, noting the changes to the academic team in this period. |

| |
|---|
| (c) The overall performance of the students, in relation to that of comparable levels of work in other institutions. |
| n/a – from practice |

| |
|--|
| (d) The strengths and weaknesses of the students in general with respect to knowledge, conceptual grasp or application of skills. |
| The strengths of the students are around the expected general skills of academic writing and presentation, as well as critical analysis. The weaknesses are subject specific and reflect the fact a number are using the Masters Degree as a conversion to another subject. Industry specific understanding is lower that would normally be expected. |

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

These seem of a good standard but one note would be that the assessment guidance seems to differ between modules, which could cause some confusion for students. Alongside this, some elements could be more industry focused rather than theoretical.

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

Being distance learning, there are some specifics not quite aligned to the question. Teaching is more about module content which when reviewed is good. Resourcing is more about availability to make contact, and evidence seen was strong in that this is occurring with those who need it.

The curriculum follows the RICS competencies but could be refined as some of the elements (taking off and using dim paper) is slightly out of kilter with the UK industry, although note the need to align to the broader competencies that employers require.

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

The content reviewed is very in depth and offers a range of content from which students can self learn

(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.)

This all seemed suitable but in terms of consistency would note again the lack of standardisation on assessment guidance.

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

The evidenced online engagement (given it is a distance learning course) was good and the form of some of the assessments with weekly tasks shows this further. In terms of professional practice, it is clear that whilst this is a masters level course, it is being undertaken by noncognates and so some of the expected level is not present.

(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 to make on this.

(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)? | 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? | | | |
| | (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? | X | | |
| | (ii) If not, was this at your request? | | | |
| 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? | | | |
| <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? | | | x |
| 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? | 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 | | |