

## BA (Hons) Public Relations 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."	<input type="checkbox"/>	
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."	<input type="checkbox"/>		
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."	<input type="checkbox"/>	
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.

The re-sit board I attended provided an appropriate space for discussion and to achieve positive outcomes for students. The Chair encouraged discussion that fostered a student-focused environment.

## 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.	Yes	No	N/A *
*Not applicable if the course is not a professional body course please 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).
The re-sit progression/ award board I attended was conducted fairly and appropriately. There was either a representative or deputy in attendance for all courses. Non-attending course representatives may consider submitting a written report or some other form of prior briefing to assist their deputising colleagues. Appropriate reference was made to regulations as required. The Chair encouraged discussion of student profiles that fostered a student-focused environment, supporting positive student outcome.

(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.)
N/A

(c) The overall performance of the students, in relation to that of comparable levels of work in other institutions.
The profiles and grades I saw were similar to those that might be expected at a re-sit board and with which I am familiar at other institutions.

(d) The strengths and weaknesses of the students in general with respect to knowledge, conceptual grasp or application of skills.
Whilst I did not examine work, I noted the very good grades achieved by students on placement in particular. This is also something that is consistent with other institutions (and is supported by the

literature) i.e. the placement opportunity as confidence-booster and its positive contribution to academic performance.

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

I did not examine assessment but the profiles at the re-sit board are consistent with such boards/ grades at other institutions of which I am familiar.

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

This was a re-sit board and as noted above performance standards were consistent with similar boards at other institutions. The placement results were very good as also noted above.

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

N/A

**(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 did not examine the module content/ assessment consistency.

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

As noted above re the positive impact of the professional practice placement.

**(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.**

N/A

**(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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>		
b.	Academic Regulations including any Professional Statutory Body requirements where appropriate (these may be included the Course Handbook)?	<input type="checkbox"/>		
c.	Module specifications (these may be in the Course Handbook)?	<input type="checkbox"/>		
d.	Assessment briefs/marketing criteria?			<input type="checkbox"/>

Draft examination papers				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	(i) Did you receive all the draft papers?			<input type="checkbox"/>
	(ii) If not, was this at your request?			<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	(i) Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?			<input type="checkbox"/>
	(ii) If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			<input type="checkbox"/>

Draft coursework				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	(i) Did you receive all the draft coursework?			<input type="checkbox"/>
	(ii) If not, was this at your request?			<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	(i) Was the nature and level of the coursework appropriate?			<input type="checkbox"/>
	(ii) If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			<input type="checkbox"/>

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?			<input type="checkbox"/>
	(ii) If you did not receive all the scripts, was the method of selection satisfactory?			<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Recommended sample sizes at Leeds Beckett University are as follows:</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>b) Samples to include all classification categories, and it is helpful to concentrate around the boundaries to include some fails.</b></p> <p><b>c) Samples to consist of internally moderated work, clearly evidencing the moderation process.</b></p>				
b.	Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?			<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Were the scripts marked in such a way to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?			<input type="checkbox"/>

Dissertations/project reports				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate?			<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?			<input type="checkbox"/>

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?			<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?			<input type="checkbox"/>

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?			<input type="checkbox"/>

Module Board/Progression and Award Boards				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	Were you able to attend the meetings? (Re-sit board only. The main board clashed with my own and so I was unable to attend the main board this year.)	<input type="checkbox"/>		
b.	Were the meetings conducted to your satisfaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>		
c.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Module Board/Progression and Award Boards?	<input type="checkbox"/>		