

Form 'External Examiners - Carnegie School Of Education' for External Examiners - Carnegie School Of Education

Submitted By	
Began	5 Aug 2023, 9:19 am
Finished	5 Aug 2023, 10:12 am
Updated	5 Aug 2023, 10:12 am
Status	<p>Default</p> <p>Last Status Change: 5 Aug 2023, 10:12 am by Rachel Bassett-Dubsky</p> <p>↻ Status change history</p>
Actions	<p>Edit submission</p> <p>Print submission</p> <p>Delete submission</p>

Page 1 of 9



**LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY**

Introduction

Carnegie School Of Education Undergraduate

- SENDI Special Ed Needs Dis & Inclsn(UG)

External Examiner ID

33623257

Name Of External Examiner:

First Name

Last Name

Collaborative Institution:

Date of Main Progression and Award Board Attended:

2023-06-22

Introduction

External Examiners are required by the terms of their appointment to submit an annual report. The report will be considered in depth during course annual monitoring activity. A record of the University's responses to examiners' reports also forms part of the documentation for this activity. It is also used in compiling our annual report on external examining.

Your report will be widely circulated and shared with Students and therefore we ask you not to refer to anyone by name or in a way that allows identification of an individual.

Please complete all sections of the report unless they are not relevant (such as you do not examine Collaborative or Degree Apprenticeship Provision). This report must be **submitted within 28 days of the main Progression and Award Board** and failure to submit within the required timescale may result in termination of your tenure as an external examiner without good reason.

NO EXAMINING FEES WILL BE PAID IF YOU FAIL TO SUBMIT YOUR ANNUAL REPORT.

Page 1 of 9

Page 2 of 9

Section A

External Examiner's Report Summary

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](#) applicable Subject Benchmark Statements / Qualification Characteristic Statements and [Leeds Beckett University regulations](#)

If any boxes are ticked "No" the Dean of School or nominee will be alerted and will oversee the response from the Course Director.

[\[HK1\]](#) Added Reference to correct section of Regulations in here.

Standards set

A1) "Threshold academic standards set for the modules/courses meet the applicable national academic standards." (required)

See 14.3.6a of regulations

Yes

Student achievement

A2) "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." (required)

14.3.6b of regulations

Yes

A2b) Please provide any further comment on the comparability of any associated collaborative provision:

Student achievement is very much comparable with similar provision with which I am familiar. It is apparent that students are supported to achieve and there is scope for students to really evidence impressive depths of knowledge, understanding and reflection.

Conduct of processes

A3) "Processes for assessment and the determination of awards are reliable, rigorous and conducted in line with the regulations at all times." (required)

see 14.3.6c of regulations

No

A3a) Please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short: (required)

Discussion with the course leader as well as evidence from most modules strongly suggests that the processes are indeed reliable, rigorous and always in line with regulations. However, I have indicated 'no' because on some modules the only evidence of second marking is a very brief statement that says a second marker agrees. Where this has been done best, there have been meaningful comments from second markers that add value to the students and transparency of grading rationale and that moderation conversation for myself. It would be a real positive and evidence best rigour to see that best practice already apparent in some modules across every module.

Professional Body Requirements

A4) Do the learning outcomes and assessment of the courses allow successful students to meet the Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies criteria at the appropriate level'. (required)

see 14.3.6a of regulations

N/A

Actions from last year's report

A5) In respect of your feedback, has any required action from last year's report been satisfactorily responded to? (required)

N/A

Issues/point for clarity during the year

A6) Did you raise any issues/point for clarity throughout the year? (required)

Yes

A6a) Please expand below how they were/were not addressed: (required)

Points raised in March after the first round of level 5 modules were completed were clearly considered by the course team and I had the opportunity to discuss them with the course leader. Questions I had about the impact of academic integrity concerns on marking and how that was reflected in grading criteria were helpfully discussed.

Aspects such as lack of diversity of assessment type in the semester one modules with 3 long written assignments due in relative proximity (and the impact of that on student grades and workload) were already a consideration for the team and did not repeat in semester two, which had a greater range of assessment types and more than one assessment per module. I will be interested to see if it has been possible to make alterations for semester one level 5 in 2024-25.

Areas of good practice/commendation

A7) Please outline any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features you have observed in relation to learning, teaching and assessment:

- The inclusion of additional qualifications in modules where relevant (such as Makaton in 17733) is a real employability asset for the students.
- In recordings of live assessments (interviews) it was lovely to see how colleagues supported students by the way they asked questions that were encouraging and led responses towards effective discussion for evidencing learning outcomes. It came through that students were known and cared about. This style of assessment looks like strong preparation for job interviews - so more evidence of employability support.
- Modules and module assignments knitted together effectively to complement each other

Page 2 of 9

Page 3 of 9

Section B

Academic Standards

Please advise on the Academic Standards for the Programme:

B1) Do the Courses and its modules continue to be coherent and generally up-to-date and at an appropriate level to enable students to meet the relevant aims and learning outcomes? (required)

Yes

B2) What do you believe were the strengths and weaknesses of the students in general with respect to knowledge, conceptual grasp or application of skills? (required)

Reflection was a real strength - because the assessments require this to happen in some depth and meaningfully inform next stages of the assessment and this is further stretched in feedback and suggestions for what marking colleagues might like to see more of.

Students were often confident to apply theory effectively to deepen and evidence their understanding - this is a real strength at level 5

A suggestion for further development would be terminology related (and the significance of the implications of terminology being why that matters) re. use of the term BAME (which I would expect to see replaced now with something like GEM) and the importance of distinguishing between 'sex' and 'gender' and why they are both important (rather than conflating or using interchangeably).

B3) Are the marking/grading criteria or marking schemes set at the appropriate level of study and have they been consistently applied including internal moderation processes? (required)

Yes

B4) Did students receive adequate and helpful feedback to inform their future learning? (required)

Yes

B5) In your view please indicate how well you feel the course prepares students for progression to managerial or professional employment or further study? (required)

0= not at all, 10= fully

9

B6) Please provide any further comments to indicate how the course could better prepare students for progression to managerial or professional employment or further study (if applicable)

Supportive suggested structures for assessments I would agree are a positive. If a student does not follow that structure completely but interprets in their own way and still covers the required content that might suggest managerial or leadership attributes but may also lead to some penalty in the marking of their work. (This is a small point - hence the 9 out of 10.)

B7) Have you had the opportunity to comment on or contribute to a review of the course including any proposed modifications or enhancements to provision? (required)

Yes

B8) If you have answered no to any of the above or would like to add any further points of clarity, please expand in the box below:

Page 3 of 9

Page 4 of 9

Section C

Assessment

Please advise on the Assessment Process for the Programme:

C1) The internal assessment / examination procedures are comparable with similar awards in the UK. (required)

Yes

C2) Procedures for the Exam Boards were fairly and rigorously conducted (including procedures governing extenuating circumstances, academic misconduct and borderline performance), and in accordance with the University's Academic Regulations. (required)

Yes

C3) The design and structure of the assessment methods used were appropriate; there was comparability within and across modules/awards in terms of level and their effectiveness in measuring the overall learning outcomes. (required)

Yes

C4) There was sufficient rigour in the achievement of learning outcomes in professional placements / work-based learning / work experience (where relevant).

Yes

C5) The moderation process is rigorous and there is consistency in marking standards. (required)

No

C6) The range of exam papers / assignments provided for sampling purposes and their appropriateness in terms of subject / level / learning outcomes were appropriate. (required)

Yes

C7) If You have answered no to any of the above or would like to add any further points of clarity, please expand in the box below:

C5 relates to transparency of moderation conversations, as already mentioned. No issue with consistency of marking standards.

Page 4 of 9

Page 5 of 9

Section D

Organisation and Arrangements

Please advise on the organisation and arrangements for you undertaking this role:

D1) I was new in post this academic year. (required)

D2) The University has helped me to undertake my role effectively. (required)

D3) I am satisfied with the range of external examiner activities undertaken and with my involvement in assessment procedures at module level. (required)

D4) I am satisfied with the appropriateness and timing of information, of draft examination papers for approval and student work for moderation. (required)

D5) I am satisfied with the on-line induction training designed to familiarise External Examiners with the University's Regulations/Procedures concerning assessment.

Newly appointed External Examiners only

D6) I am satisfied with the level of support received from my mentor.

External Examiners new to the role only

D7) I am satisfied with the programme-level induction provided by the Course Director to familiarise me with the programme itself. (required)

D8) Are there any general or specific comments on the development and support offered by the University, especially improvements you would like to see:

The Education@LeedsBeckett team have been particularly supportive, speedy and helpful with any queries of date confirmations. Thank you.

I was given a mentor as a new EE in the 2021-22 year but as the course was only level 4 at that stage it was not so useful. It would have been more useful this year with the first level 5 work, but as I had been involved in the development of the course and had thorough paperwork that structured what was expected in response, that was sufficient so there was no issue.

D9) If You have answered no to any of the above or would like to add any further points of clarity, please expand in the box below:

Page 5 of 9

Page 6 of 9

Section E

Collaborative Provision

Please indicate if you have been satisfied with the following:

E) Do you examine collaborative provision?

Page 6 of 9

Page 7 of 9

Section F

Degree Apprenticeships

F1) Were you involved in the examination of Apprenticeship Provision?

Open comments

Page 7 of 9

Page 8 of 9

Section G

End Point Assessment

G1) I have seen evidence that Apprentices have the opportunity to practice the assessment methods that will be used at End Point Assessment before undertaking the End Point Assessment.

G2) If you examine integrated apprenticeship provision, please provide specific comments on the suitability and content of End Point Assessment:

G3) If you have answered no to any of the above or would like to add any further points of clarity, please expand in the box below:

Where applicable, a copy of your report will be shared with the Chief External Examiner who is appointed to provide oversight of related modules and/or courses.

Page 8 of 9

Page 9 of 9

Final Comments

Are there any other final comments you would like to make in relation to your role as External Examiner?

The course team have been through many changes over the past 3 years and I appreciate that has been challenging as they have had to jump straight in to outcomes and frameworks they may have designed differently. I would commend them on that not coming through in the materials I have seen and certainly not showing through in the work or outcomes of the students.

The BA SENDI is an excellent course and the standards evidenced in much of the students' work are highly impressive.

It is so important to see courses that are SENDI specific continuing and the students enrolled on them doing so well.

I appreciate the opportunity to be involved and look forward to hopefully being able to meet the team and students in person in the 2023-24 academic year.

End of Tenure Report

If you are at the end of your tenure as External Examiner, please provide an overview of the development of the programme during your term of office. This overview will be of value to the University, the programme team and to the incoming External Examiner.

Please include commentary regarding academic standards and student achievement across cohorts during the examiner's period of appointment:

This Section is only to be completed by external examiners at the end of their tenure.

Email Address (required)

Date (required)

Page 9 of 9

POWERED BY  simplicity