

Form 'External Examiners - School of Health' for

External Examiners - School of Health

There is 1 other submission attached or associated with this student for this form. (click for more info)

Submitted By	
Began	21 Dec 2023, 9:15 am
Finished	21 Dec 2023, 9:56 am
Updated	21 Dec 2023, 9:58 am
Status	External Examiners - Shared with School Last Status Change: 21 Dec 2023, 9:58 am by Kay Hartley  Status change history
Actions	Edit submission Print submission Delete submission

Page 1 of 9



Introduction

School of Health

Postgraduate

- MSABR Applied Biomedicl Sci Research(TP)
- MSBIS MSBIS Inter Mstr Frmwrk Route(TP)
- MSMBC MSMBC Inter Mstr Frmwrk Route(TP)
- MSMBL MSMBL Inter Mstr Frmwrk Route(TP)

External Examiner ID

Name Of External Examiner:

First Name

Last Name

Collaborative Institution:

Date of Main Progression and Award Board Attended:

7 Nov 2023

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:

n/a

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

Yes

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

Yes

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)

No

A5a) Please expand below: (required)

See the comment below for A6.

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)

I have previously asked for more clarity around marking annotations on student submissions. This in my opinion has improved but is still below what I would expect to see on all modules. The use of quick marks could be a good starting point in-line with a designated rubric. At the moment there are ambiguities in terms of how a mark has been derived in some modules and even within module across multiple assessments. I am still also unsure on how student feedback (module and programme review) is gathered as it is quite variable in terms of what is presented to me and the level of feedback that seems to be provided by the students.

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 courses continue to deliver a very contemporary curriculum that is well designed and from what I can see well delivered. The assessments that I have sight of are well designed and are set at the correct level - my comments rom previous years have been addressed in terms of levelness.

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)

This is hard to say based on the information available. But I would think that the strength of the LB students will be in terms of their multidisciplinary knowledge applied to biomedical and wider biosciences. Having not spoken to any students, I can not accurately gauge their real understanding of their subject - there are some very impressive pieces of coursework on some modules though.

For B4) Some modules fall below what I would like to see in terms of feedback level and depth for assessments.

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)

No

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

8

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)

This is a rather strange question that needs more clarity in terms of what you want and the geographical context. However, based on the graduate prospects of the students leaving these courses I would say that they are equipped with the basic transferable skills needed for graduate employment. I would also say that this could be quite variable based on the large international cohort that seems to be present and if they decide to return to their native countries beyond their studies at LB.

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:

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)

Yes

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:

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)

No

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

External Examiners new to the role only

N/A

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

Yes

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

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?

No

Page 6 of 9

Page 7 of 9

Section F

Degree Apprenticeships

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

No

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.

N/A

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.

Final Comments

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

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)

21 Dec 2023