Leeds Business School

Postgraduate

- HRMPD Human Resource Management(TP)
- MAHRM Human Resource Management(TP)
- MHRMT Human Resource Management(TP)

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:

Evidence of second marking for major reports, and also when required a third marker to resolve discrepancies between 1st and 2nd Marker. I am pleased to confirm the introduction of the new Assessment for new MAHRM Dissertation Project, which meets the CIPD professional body requirements for this module. November 2019

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.	X		

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

(a) The operation and conduct of the Progression and Award Board (and/or Module Board meeting you may also have attended).

Professional, and competent. Student's achievement reviewed individually, Course Director present to deal with queries and confirm award. Due to Covid 19 the June board has been cancelled, however I have received email communication via the Course Director, and Administration team who have provided me with the collated course results to review. These documents provide an overview of the student results, detailing the recommended actions and rationale, and a copy of the new assessment guidelines which outlines changes in process and assessments due to Covid 19.

(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.

There was a range of grades and awards which reflects those achieved at other comparable institutions.

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

On the IBM module there are succinct feed-forward comments, to support student's progression and understanding of the areas of enhancement in the future.

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

The Dissertation and Major reports meet the requirements of the professional body, and are clearly outlined.

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

NA

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

It has been particularly beneficial (due to Covid 19) to be able to view IBM reports online and access the Assessment comments via turnitin.

(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.)

I specific reviewed a range of dissertation when I attended the November board, the module guides are clear and supportive, module structured was appropriate and there was evidence of Supervision throughout the process.

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

N/A

(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.

The feedback provided to students on the dissertation could be enhanced:
The Dissertation reviewed in November 2019
There was evidence of good practice, in the use of second and third markers to ensure differences in the initial grades awarded by assessors were resolved.
Review the quality/clarity/amount of feedback provided by different tutors/ assessors, some inconsistencies here. (this includes font sizes and copying and pasting from previously completed feedback reports)
There is a inconsistency of the feedback comments, it would be more supportive for students if the comments of some assessor were more specific, ie ' the rationale could have been stronger' the Learning statement includes ' all/nearly all' which is it ? , and on occasions some feedback did not reflect the overall grade awarded.
The IBM reviewed July 2020
I was able to review these reports online, access date 23.07.2020.
The Assessors online feedback was accessible via turnitin, comments from the 1st and 2ndMarkers were visible and the overall grade achieved under each criteria of assessment. The comments were succinct and did provided the students, with a brief rationale of achievement and were supportive in terms of enhancements / areas of development moving forward.
To meet CIPD standards, please review the requirements to include a credible Implementation Plan, in particular Student :77200090 failed to submit, and overall the level of detail could be improved.

(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).

External Examiner's report summary

N/A