

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

Submitted By	
Began	16 Oct 2023, 3:41 pm
Finished	16 Oct 2023, 4:04 pm
Updated	17 Oct 2023, 8:29 am
Status	External Examiners - Shared with School Last Status Change: 17 Oct 2023, 8:29 am by Kay Hartley  Status change history
Actions	Edit submission Print submission Delete submission

Page 1 of 9



Introduction

Leeds School Of Arts

Postgraduate

- MARFU Architecture Futures(TP)

External Examiner ID

Name Of External Examiner:

First Name

Last Name

Collaborative Institution:

Date of Main Progression and Award Board Attended:

2023-10-12

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:

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

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)

No

A5a) Please expand below: (required)

Las year I advised that Ethical issues should be considered as part of the Research Methods course. This has not been addressed yet

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:

Last year I commented on the quality and intellectual ambition of the lectures, studio briefs, and student work. This year, the quality of the student work is higher (and recognised beyond the school by competition awards), and the ambition of the course has not decreased.

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)

Students show sound academic writing skills and critical engagement with a topic of choice. At the moment, their limited knowledge of ethics is a weakness. Their knowledge and application of research methods could be reinforced too.

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)

It could be more strategic with the area/s of expertise offered by the course (in response to emerging areas in practice)

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)

N/A

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).

N/A

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

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:

The support offered has been great, thank you

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:

Section E

Collaborative Provision

Please indicate if you have been satisfied with the following:

E) Do you examine collaborative provision?

No

Section F

Degree Apprenticeships

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

No

Open comments

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?

This year, the examination was very well organised, well in advance, and the information easy to locate, so thank you for making my job easy. The PowerPoint presentation was particularly useful to get the context of the modules and the potential direction of the programme.

Strengths:

Last year I commented on the quality and intellectual ambition of the lectures, studio briefs, and student work. This year, the quality of the student work is higher (and recognised beyond the school by competition awards), and the ambition of the course has not decreased.

Overall, the programme's content and intention set it apart from other postgraduate courses, and make it particularly appropriate for anyone with a background in architecture or urban design who wants to learn about practice-based research and interdisciplinarity. At the same time, students are given the possibility to carry out 'more traditional' research in written format. For instance, getting students to work in a co-design or participatory design scenario is particularly valuable, and the programme gives the student the brilliant experience of community engagement and work-in-progress exhibitions with the wider public. The students are exposed to highly valuable experience, and this seems to resonate with their satisfaction at the end of the course. The half-day Context Symposium also offers a great opportunity to learn dissemination skills.

As a one-year (FT) postgraduate course, the students benefit from excellent resources and staff input, including the support of quality Open Lecture series, and Professional Practice symposium. Also, in one year, the master offers a very well managed progression from different levels of difficulty and skill in approaching an academic piece of work (from 3,000 to 6,000- and 12,000-words essays). This is particularly helpful for those students who have not been introduced to academic inquiry before.

Another asset of the programme is the involvement of the staff and tutors. The work shows -although this is not clearly articulated in the course documents- that students benefit from hands-on feedback and support. Perhaps the staff approach to feedback could be clearly articulated in the course documents (e.g. milestones for -written- formative feedback).

Recommendations:

I note that there has been changes to the Research Methods module. I wonder if this fully supports the possibilities open to students by the briefs (for example, research methods from the Social Sciences -interviews, focus groups, facilitation, surveys...- and ethical issues do not feature on the syllabus). Students, however, are exposed to Ethics and Ethical Approval, but this is not articulated either on the syllabus or the student work. I understand this is dealt with by the supervisor of the dissertation, but perhaps the Research Methods module/lecture series could offer more support. It seems to me that perhaps students could benefit from attending research-specific modules delivered in other university programmes so MARFU project tutors don't have to cover all expertise (analysis of surveys, interviews, ethical practice...).

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