School of Computing, Creative Technology and Engineering

Undergraduate

- BSCMT Creative Media Technology(UG)

Please indicate, 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.

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 meet with the requirements of the relevant National Qualifications Statement's."	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' who have been awarded qualifications have had the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in course(s) or subjects in other UK institutions with which I am familiar." *Not applicable – if you are a practitioner and are not in a position to assess this statement, please note here:	X		

Please provide any further comment on the comparability of collaborative provision

If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short:

External Examiner's report summary

Conduct of process

	Yes	No	
"In my view, the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are reliable, 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.

Actions from last year's report
(This will not be relevant if you are examining for the first time)

Yes

Areas of good practice/commendation

Any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to learning, teaching and assessment:

Curriculum is regularly revised to ensure it is up to date and relevant. Use of both Macs and PCs enables latest software and a broad and relevant skill set for graduates entering industry.

A great deal of collaboration among staff when teaching and assessing.

Very detailed feedback in modules, closely linked to learning outcomes.

The profile of students has been challenging in the past and this year is further affected by COVID-19, so it is a testament to the hard work and dedication of the team that performance overall has not been dramatically affected.

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

	Yes	No	N/A*
"In my view, the professional body requirements for this course have been met.			

*Not applicable if the course is not a professional body courseplease indicate here.			
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).

Paperwork was appropriate, with checks conducted along the way. Issues/errors were dealt with swiftly and appropriately. I understand that all students were given a 4 week extension to assignments due to COVID-19. However, I noticed quite a few full or partial NS, yet for partial NS, a final grade was still recorded and was unsure of the consequences of this for the students. Would further attempts be allowed? Would these be capped? Also, unusual that External Examiners were not invited to attend a virtual 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.)

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

Comparable and appropriate for FHEQ L5/6. Module completion and level progression issues due to COVID-19 appear broadly in line with the rest of the sector.

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

Creative use of digital technologies is a substantial strength. However, there is scope for providing more opportunities for students to develop critical thinking and analytical skills.

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

Processes and procedures are for the most part clear and appear to have been followed. There is a good range of work produced for all of the modules I looked at. Handling of some COVID-19 issues was less clear, however. Assessment is by coursework only, which is appropriate and typical for the subject area. Assessments are clearly expressed and linked to learning outcomes. However, modules which are electives and not dedicated BSCMT course modules differ quite a bit from BSCMT-specific modules in their teaching and learning approach, the format of their briefs, and their marking schemes, e.g. Script Writing, Portraiture, Mobile Gaming. These are generally less transparent and consistent in how they are

organised, designed. and marked. Arrangements for adjustments to assignments due to COVID-19 appeared sensible, with one exception, Professional Portfolio, and was fed back to the team.

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

Well resourced with an appropriate curriculum and delivery, and knowledgeable and experienced staff. Appropriate adjustments made for COVID-19.

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

Consistent and well-resourced across BSCMT-specific modules, but less uniform with electives such as Script Writing and Portraiture.

(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.)

Highly relevant content with strong levels of consistency across BSCMT-specific modules, both in terms of delivery and assessment. BSCMT-specific modules, their assessments and marking schemes are clearly related to learning outcomes. Specific module observations/comments:

YEAR 2:
INTERACTIVE MEDIA DESIGN - Useful reflection by module leader to counter issues identified. Very extensive feedback provided to students. Decision to switch this module to an elective in future may solve some issues while also giving students greater flexibility in pursuing their interests.

VIDEO POST PRODUCTION - More borderline final marks than other modules (69, 49, and two 59s). Not all of these were included in moderation but some were. It would be helpful to include all borderlines and state why they should remain (e.g. late submissions?) or if adjustments are required. Nice idea to utilise a Vimeo channel. Would be helpful to include separate marks per criterion with the feedback – not just the mark overall.

GROUP PROJECT - Was run as previous years, which seems to work well and integrates practical and professional creative skills. Similar marks profile to previous years. No issues noted.

YEAR 3:
MOBILE GAMING - Only 2 BSCMT students took this module, both of which were affected in whole or in part by NS. Marking scheme would benefit from including some individual marking criteria rather than overall grade descriptor.

PROFESSIONAL PORTFOLIO - Average is lowest from past few years, some of which may be attributed to COVID-19, however the average has becoming lower year on year anyway. Some students were brought down or failed overall because of a fail on the presentation (C2). C2 uniquely assesses LO4, but actually only partly (face-to-face communication). C2 was changed to a written job application from an interview

due to COVID-19, and so does not involve face-to-face communication anyway. Therefore, C2 was penalising students even when they would appear to have met the module LOs. I therefore recommended an adjustment to marks that was actioned by the Board (take the highest of either the Portfolio or the current calculated Final Mark, for students who had submitted all components). For equity, I have recommended that students who have not yet submitted C2 would also need to have this adjustment applied at the re-sit board. Internal moderation showed some disagreements, but it's less clear how this filters into the specific grade for a student. From one perspective, it's very transparent as all disagreements are noted, but from another perspective, it's hard to see the forest for the trees. In future, could marks from separate markers, final marks, and then a note to justify it be recorded, as per university form?

DESIGN THINKING - Weighting of service proposal (30%) vs. service blueprint (70%) updated from previous year and more appropriate. Marks profile has improved on last year and more in line with the cohort's performance across the level.

PRODUCTION PROJECT - Slightly lower than previous years but no doubt impacted by COVID-19. A good range of work. Evaluation seems more reflective than evaluative. Given that the use of methodology to test and evaluate and critical evaluation are required by LOs 3 and 4 respectively, the team should consider directing the students to using quantitative and/or qualitative evaluation methods and analysis. Also, despite very extensive feedback, it is still important for marking transparency and for full student understanding of their assessment, that feedback is per criterion, preferably with marks per criterion too, not just overall.

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

Team continue to be regularly engaged with updating their teaching and learning skills within the subject. I'm not aware of how staff have been engaged in research, scholarship or professional activities this year, so cannot comment on those.

(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).

N/A