External Examiner's Report

Year: 2020-21

Name of External Examiner	
Name of Course(s)	**FD Supporting Teaching and Learning**
Name of LCC Course Manager	
Date of Board Examiners	**24/06/2021**
Date of Report	**02/07/2021**

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/ provision annual monitoring and review activity. A record of the departments' responses to examiners' reports also forms part of the documentation for this activity.

Your report will be widely circulated. Please do not refer to anyone by name or in a way that allows identification of an individual.

This form consists of two sections, the **Summary** and the **Main Report**, both of which you are required to complete. Please note that no fees can be paid until the College receives your full report for the year. **This report must be submitted within 28 days of the relevant Board of Examiners.** The **Summary Report** enables us to gain an immediate overview of External Examiners' reports and to identify any matters of concern. The **Main Report** is primarily used during course/ provision annual monitoring and review activity as described above. It is also used in compiling the College's annual report on external examining.

External Examiner's report summary

Please indicate in the relevant boxes below whether you agree with the statements about the standards of Leeds City College's awards, the standards of student performance and the conduct of the College's assessment processes.

Please also list any shortcomings and areas for commendation. You should expand on any issues you mention here in the main report.

Standards set		
	Yes	**No**
"In my view, the standards set for the awards are appropriate."	**/**	
If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.		

Student performance		

	Yes	No	N/A *
"In my view, the standards of student performance are comparable with similar course(s) or subjects in other UK institutions with which I am familiar."	/		
I have reviewed a sample of student work from the collaborative / franchise institution and in my view the standards of student performance are comparable with students studying the award(s) at Leeds Met	/ **Compara ble with Keighly**		
* Not applicable – if you are a practitioner and are not in a position to assess national standards 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		
"In my view, the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted."	**Yes**	**No**
	/	
*If your answer is '**no**', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.*		

Areas for commendation
Any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes
In some modules, highly detailed feedback was given from lecturers to students within their feedback panels. However, at times, it seems that some feedback is a generic copy and paste. An example of this would being Noted the need for the student to follow Harvard referencing conventions with no more detail. This same phrasing was seen in students feedback across Level four modules. This may have potentially led to the same errors appearing students work at level five.

Main report

In this section you are asked to describe more fully how the College has or has not maintained academic standards and the quality of the student experience in relation to the course(s) for which you are the external examiner.

Please write a report (in addition to completing the Summary) in sections under <u>all</u> the following areas.

(a) The operation and conduct of the Board of Examiners (and any Mitigation Panel or Examination Committee meeting you may also have attended).

The conduct of the board, confirmation of marks, grades and additional circumstances was carried out with a high level of rigour and professionalism. Discrepancies were noted by the panel and rectified immediately.

(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 as first summer exam board.

(c) The overall performance of the students, in relation to that of comparable levels of work in other institutions.

Three students have been tracked across the year in their attainment from the beginning of the year to the end. This group consisted of: higher, middle and lower attaining students.

The higher attaining student was given feedback which suggested opportunities for stretch and grow. However, some referencing issues were not fully address with specific feedback. The student maintained a 70+ mark average across the year.

The middle grade average student was still displaying issues with clarity, SPaG, typos and referencing which was broadly addressed at the beginning of the year. I wonder if specific feedback with examples given would have helped to prevent this within the second semester.

The lower attaining student did have a mark increase from the beginning of the year to the end. The student responded well to elements of feedback. Again, to wonder if more specific feedback in the panel would help to extend the students understanding of the quick notes used. Most feedback is formative and supportive, although one comment from a marker of their work being 'weak' may impact upon the self-efficacy of a student who is struggling to meet the required criteria. Consideration of formative and supportive language for all markers might support student's confidence and therefore future intrinsic motivation. However, most feedback given was supportive.

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

The range of student marks and abilities are in parallel with those seen in other HE institutions. Feedback given to students are in line with their level of ability and mark, for instance, formative feedback for those at the lower end of the spectrum and signposts to stretch the students at the higher

end. Having the mark rubric included and accessible to students via Turnitin would help students to consolidate this feedback to a higher level and may well use this as a supportive guide when preparing for future assessments or resubmissions. I would urge that the rubrics are included in the future for this reason.

Referencing errors are addressed within in text and end text feedback for guidance on how to improve on these points in future submissions. However, in some modules this can be a little vague. Specific feedback and guidance for referencing errors for Level four students would help to prevent the same errors appearing at Level five, which has been noted in this review.

As mentioned in my spring report, suggestions to help tackle this further would be to provide examples of correct referencing formats could be added to in text feedback rather than quick marks in places.

The inclusion of grade rubrics would also support the students to identify areas which is impacting upon their mark potential, for example, clarity.

Higher attaining students submit content which is informed, referenced, and demonstrates a knowledge and understanding of key theoretical concepts with links to real world examples in industry. This is commented on positively within feedback from lecturers.

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

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

The assessments across both levels and semesters, offer students the opportunity to make and include resources and real-world applications. This will help students to prepare for industry whilst also providing a potential catalyst for analysis and reflection.

Feedback is done in relation to the assessment criteria, with strengths acknowledged and areas for development identified. Some of these feedback panels are lengthy due to the amount of feedback given. Therefore, using some formatting to bolden text in these areas may benefit students navigating their way through this and make developmental guidance more explicit and easier to access for lower attaining students. This is carried out in some modules but not all.

Internal moderation is thorough with dialogues clear to access. This suggests a robustness to this process. Not all final marks are logged within the tables to display which final mark was decided upon

following professional conversations. However, this is documented within the IV comments. The IV's suggestions have been taken into consideration regarding the use of LO'd quickmarks to highlight to students where they are meeting the require criteria have been implemented across most modules and seem to work well.

(g) Comments on the use of the VLE within the course(s) (if applicable)..

Comments given within the feedback panels is constructive. However, the vague elements previously mentioned may not show the student what they have done wrong and what they need to do to correct this.

In some modules, highly detailed feedback was given from lecturers to students within their feedback panels. However, at times, it seems that some feedback is a generic copy and paste. An example of this would being Noted the need for the student to follow Harvard referencing conventions with no more detail. This same phrasing was seen in students feedback across Level four modules. This may have potentially led to the same errors appearing students work at level five.

As mentioned in my spring report, signposts to intext feedback to give examples of when something has been done well. This could also be applied to incorrect incidences of referencing for example and the correct version added, then quick marks used for following occurrences. This would strengthen the dialogue between the feedback panel and in text comments. Students may then engage more with these explicit and individualised signposts.

(h) Module content, consistency of modules and module assessment across the course and the achievement of learning outcomes.

Practical and professional skills are highlighted within the assessment criterion for modules this helps students to see the skills needed in industry. This also applies to the transferable skills element.

(i) Areas of good practice you have identified – please expand on the key areas for commendation listed in the summary.

IV process indicates some mentoring of staff who maybe new to first marking. Coaching and feedback given in this process appear to have been taken on board.

(j) The College welcomes external examiners' comments on its developing 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.

Is there a COVID 19 No Detriment policy? I have been unable to access one and I think if the situation is on-going then this should be considered to ensure those who attend beyond the traditional student demographic are not at a detriment to others. For example working parents, or social economic barriers.

For all External Examiners

Are there any changes in your circumstances that the College needs to know about, eg. a change of address?

Signature	
Date:	02/07/2021