

Form 'External Examiners - Leeds School Of Arts' for External Examiners - Leeds School Of Arts

Submitted By	
Began	23 Jun 2023, 8:56 am
Finished	23 Jun 2023, 1:06 pm
Updated	27 Jun 2023, 12:52 pm
Status	External Examiners - Shared with School
Actions	<p>Edit submission</p> <p>Print submission</p> <p>Delete submission</p>

Page 1 of 9



**LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY**

Introduction

Leeds School Of Arts

Undergraduate

- ARCHA Architecture(UG)

External Examiner ID

Name Of External Examiner:

First Name

Last Name

Collaborative Institution:

Date of Main Progression and Award Board Attended:

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

N/A*

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

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)

Yes

Issues/point for clarity during the year

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

No

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:

In the work samples examined and in the interviews, the students demonstrated accomplished graphic and verbal presentation skills and, in many cases, the ability to synthesize their studio design responses from the themes underpinning the design briefs and from their parallel studies in Architectural Context and Architectural Technology. The studio design briefs were suitably challenging, inspiring, and based strongly on relevant theory. This year, across most of the studios, there was an emphasis on physical model-making as a means of design development - resulting in some very enjoyable and expressive work. As in previous years the rigor of the assessment process, whereby all of the design submissions are cross-marked by all of the tutors was commendable, resulting in reliable and accurate grade profiles.

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)

At the highest level, the students demonstrated excellent analytical skills and the ability to develop their analysis, in their studio projects, into convincing and compelling architectural design propositions. In some cases, greater depth could have been demonstrated in the technical or material resolution of the project work. Some of the studio work presented required the AT3.2 submission in order to be fully understood as a prediction of the built 'outcome'. In the best examples, the technology components (AT 3.1, 3.2, etc.) were an opportunity for students to explore and further develop ideas involving experimental materials and techniques emerging from their design proposition. There were, however, few students who demonstrated an in-depth knowledge of the performance requirements of building envelopes in response to the climate crisis generally and to embodied carbon and energy use specifically. It is likely that the calculation and/or modeling of these key metrics will form a key part of the design processes undertaken by architects and it is essential that students are introduced to the methodologies involved at the earliest possible stage (preferably at Level 4) so that they become intrinsic and not perceived as being relevant only to the Professional Studies modules.

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

10

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)

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)

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)

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)

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

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

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

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:

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

N/A

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.

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?

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.

Any overview of the development of the course from the start of my tenure in 2020 to its end this year is necessarily coloured by the effects of the pandemic in 2020 and 2021 when much of the teaching was carried out online and 'in-person' visits to the school were not possible. This was particularly problematic in the context of a subject that relies on close relationships between tutors and students and on the studio experience of peer interaction and 'learning through making' - using the school's workshop facilities and the expertise available within them. It is unsurprising, therefore, that the standard of work and the quality of the learning experience as perceived by the students has improved since 2021; but it is a tribute to the school and its staff that standards were maintained to the extent that they were during the lockdown and that it was able to recover in the way that it has.

In previous years the key concerns identified centered on the inconsistencies between the scale, ambition, and relevance of the studio briefs; the possible disadvantages of the vertical atelier system, and the implementation of the technology modules in BA3, where it was felt that the AT3 work did not always represent an adequate response to the design of structural systems or building envelopes relevant to the AD3 studio projects. These concerns have been successfully addressed during the last 2 - 3years, with more consistent studio briefs (and tuition) providing greater parity, and more tightly defined AT briefs ensuring that the core learning outcomes for technology are achieved. The vertical atelier system, abandoned in 2021/22 (partly in response to the concerns of the External Examiners) was re-instituted this year, without detriment to the quality of the work in BA2 or BA3, but this aspect of the course structure needs to be monitored in order to ensure that its possible weaknesses (reduced diversity of available theoretical positions, 'tutor fatigue' etc.) do not re-emerge in the future.

The students, in their interviews, have been (even during the pandemic) almost universally appreciative of the high level of commitment and support offered by their tutors and of the school's collegiate spirit - engendered by its small but dedicated staff team.

Email Address (required)

Date (required)

23-Jun-2023

Page 9 of 9