

Form 'External Examiners - Carnegie School Of Sport' for External Examiners - Carnegie School Of Sport

Submitted By	
Began	17 Jul 2023, 10:11 am
Finished	19 Jul 2023, 3:59 pm
Updated	19 Jul 2023, 3:59 pm
Status	Default Last Status Change: 19 Jul 2023, 3:59 pm by Mike Price  Status change history
Actions	Edit submission Print submission Delete submission

Page 1 of 9



Introduction

Carnegie School Of Sport

Undergraduate

- BSESF Sport & Exercise Science (FY)(UG)
- SPEXS Sport and Exercise Science(UG)

External Examiner ID

Name Of External Examiner:

First Name

Last Name

Collaborative Institution:

Date of Main Progression and Award Board Attended:

2023-06-22

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:

N/A

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:

There was a generally a high standard of consistent feedback provided.

Evidence of standardisation and moderation processes was clear and does seem to have worked well. This is a robust system should grades be challenged. I saw only one incident where marks following assessment had to be adjusted by the module leader (due to an assessor sticking rigidly to a marking scheme). This was explained fully in the module documentation and appropriately by the module leader. Thus, there was some good quality assurance undertaken here and will likely result in some further standardisation ‘training’ or awareness for next years’ assessors.

Projects: There was assessment specifically relating to academic skills and professionalism, providing incentives to engage in the various avenues of support offered. For those who did engage in process, this was beneficial to their grade.

Employability: Modules such as these are now common within the sector and they certainly have an important place in every curriculum. For the job interview and application process one assessor feedback I read stated whether the student would have been shortlisted and whether they were appointable. If not already, I would urge staff to develop this as a standard feedback criterion for each. If appropriately worded this will give confidence to those students who engage and prepare well and may act as a professional nudge to those who may have not taken the assessment seriously. Either result is, in many ways, positive for all students in generating awareness of the effort required to generate successful applications, selection for interview and perform well, giving them a better chance of appointment in a competitive job market.

Performance in extreme environments: Here there was clear use of the multidisciplinary team approach often used in sport and exercise science (and many other disciplines) to the assessment, in what is often considered predominantly physiological content. All key sport and exercise disciplines had to be considered in detail within the assessment.

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)

The students seem to be able to grasp the applied nature of Sport and Exercise Science and are prepared with real world scenarios.

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

8

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)

The course has many applied aspects and employability points. The question is probably more related to how to engage the entire cohort fully.

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:

N/A

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)

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:

N/A

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)

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)

No

D8) Are there any general or specific comments on the development and support offered by the University, especially improvements you would like to see:

Administrative support has been excellent. The use of a Sharepoint link was a welcome development in accessing all the required assessment and module information.
All modules had the standardised module reports form etc., which made the examiners role easier, a point I raised last year.

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:

D4 - I did have two exams sent to me very late which meant I was not able to provide comments on time for one – however, these were assessment questions I had previously moderated so was no quality issue per se.
D7 - I don't remember having such an induction, however I am experienced in external examining and this is not a major concern.

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

N/A

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:

N/A

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:

N/A

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.

Final Comments

Are there any other final comments you would like to make in relation to your role as External Examiner?

Both the module and progression boards ran smoothly. Boards were rigorous, consistent and fair.

Staff were well prepared for both boards and the 'behind the scenes' work was evident.

As with last year there was a good set of final results for each level. My initial tally of the classifications of each level of study at the programme board (not an official analysis), showed there was a clear levelling up at L4 with students performing well (likely) in areas they had studied before, and learn appropriately in area they had not. Subsequently, there was a good number of higher grades at L4 (27% first class; 46% 2i; 24% 2ii). As expected, the distribution of grades shifted at L5 with fewer first class and 2i grades but these were still very good and deserved (18% first class; 34% 2i, 37% 2ii) with a similar profile maintained at L6 (21% first class; 37% 2i; 33% 2ii) which is commendable (and likely reflects entry grades?).

Results were presented according to academic advisor group, although not affecting my role per se, it shows (as I understand it) a consolidated approach to pastoral and academic support across a large number of students, which can only be beneficial.

Last year a number of modules cropped up as fail repeats (Young athlete development, Sport and exercise science in action) which does not seem to have occurred this year. Students therefore seem to have a better grasp of what is required, either through their own engagement or staff explanation.

This year I was also aware of The Dean’s list, providing acknowledgment of good student performance rather than focussing on those students who are struggling.

The use of AI by students in writing assessments was noted for the first time and demonstrates a sector wide shift regarding originality. Leeds Beckett therefore seem to be on top of such developments.

There were some minor wording errors on some students feedback – staff need to be sure that descriptors are appropriate for the grade, for example, stating ‘Very good explanation...’ but awarded 55% does not tally. There may have been a good introduction to an answer, but then staff need to clearly state what was not included or resulted on the lower grade.

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.

N/A

Email Address (required)

Date (required)

2023-07-19

Page 9 of 9