

## Carnegie School Of Sport

### Undergraduate

- SPEXS Sport and Exercise Science(UG)

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:

### 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:

### 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 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).

Not Applicable

(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.

The standards of student performance were comparable with similar courses in other UK institutions

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

Numerous students on the programmes show a high level of attainment and are clearly engaged with the subject area, module content and are achieving first class marks. Those students who are failing appear not to have evidenced sufficient engagement with the module teaching and learning activities. The programmes are of an applied nature and some students demonstrate a greater knowledge, conceptual grasp and application of relevant skills within coursework assignments of a more academic/scientific nature. Other students have attained better grades in laboratory/ practical or more applied assignments. Some of the students have shown good evidence of transferable skills, such as those evidenced by academic presentations. There was evidence of a range of conceptual and synthesis of academic/scientific knowledge across the modules reviewed.

Some of the modules examined contained a large/occasional very large number of registered students. I was impressed by the level of standardisation/moderation, and the large volume of student marking that had been undertaken by module staff in a timely manner. Maintaining consistency in marking and measuring attainment will be an ongoing challenge within larger student modules requiring numerous staff involved in the assessment process. The assessment process nonetheless appeared consistent, fair and transparent.

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

Overall, I have seen an extensive range of different methods of assessment across the programmes. I was impressed by some of the innovative assessment methods utilised and, in some cases, the comprehensive nature of the assessments. For each module reviewed, I have viewed an appropriate sample of fails, distinctions and a suitable sample of other marks. All marks have been agreed/moderated in most cases, there were relatively few instances where the moderation process had not been transparent.

In selected cases, (due to the current COVID-19) circumstances, examples of module written examination scripts from across the sample were not available to view directly. However, examination model answers and relevant marking processes were clear and transparent.

I should state that for selected Semester 1 modules, examples of components of assessment were not always available to view or assessment modes are altered due to COVID-related circumstances. Namely, L5 Physiological responses to exercise (CLASS TEST 50%).

L6 Performance in Extreme Environments; (modified to 100% Coursework).

For the written assignments, there was good evidence of staff annotation of the scripts /feedback and

summary comments. I can confirm I have reviewed a sample of Physiology Dissertations. Again, there was good evidence of staff annotation of the scripts /feedback and summary comments. On request, comprehensive moderation proforma/ evidence of the internal moderation process for the physiology dissertation sample were supplied.

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

The curriculum is current and contemporary, and often has an applied focus. Overall, the staff are to be complimented on their commitment to the students, the comprehensive nature of the curriculum taught and assessed. I agree with previous EE reports of appropriate demonstrations of 'added value' that staff provide for the programmes.

The range of projects that the students undertake is impressive, and there is evidence of sound supervision.

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

Not Applicable

(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.)

Overall, I am satisfied with the module content, consistency of modules and module assessment across the course and the achievement of learning outcomes.

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

Staff are highly motivated and dedicated and continue to develop innovative ways to improve the student experience. There is a wide variety of teaching and learning methods evident within the modules, in addition to a variety of standard and some more innovative assessment types. Staff are research active and this is evident in their research-informed teaching and quality of student projects.

(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.

Previous comments on the review of the 40% pass mark applicable to postgraduate taught provision has been given consideration.

(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).

Not Applicable