



The Open
University

Centre for Inclusion and Collaborative Partnerships (CICP)

External Examiner report template

An electronic copy of this report should be sent to:

cicp-external-examiners@open.ac.uk

Or, a signed hard copy sent to:

The Director, CICP, The Open University, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA,
United Kingdom.

You should also submit a copy of this report to the institution.

Section A: General information

Institution:	Leeds City College
Programme:	FD Health and Wellbeing
Subject examined:	Health
Name of examiner:	Dr David Matthews
Address:	
E-mail:	
Current year of appointment	Second

Section B: External examiner's report

The reporting structure of this section is intended to help draw out issues which may require attention by the Institution or the University. It should not be seen as limiting in any way the range of issues which may be addressed or the level of detail given. The report will be considered as part of the annual evaluation process and, as such, external examiners are encouraged to be as frank and open as possible, but avoiding wherever possible references to individual staff or students. External examiners' attention is also drawn to 'The Guide for external examiners of OU validated awards', which should be forwarded by partner institutions to their external examiners.

Please comment as appropriate on:
1. The range of assessed material and information provided by the institution on which your report is based.
A wide range of material was provided, across both levels 4 and 5. The material provided ensured ample opportunity to assess the work.
2. Whether the standards set are appropriate for the award, or award element, by reference to any agreed subject benchmarks, qualifications framework, programme specification or other relevant information.
All assessed work, as well as assessments, meet the standards required as set by benchmark statements, and are appropriate to be part of a foundation degree award. There was one query, which I made the team aware of, with regards to the reflective assignment for Developing Professional Practice (L5), in terms of whether it allows students to demonstrate the cognitive skills required at that level. From the assignment brief, as well as the work produced by students, especially those who achieved the highest grades, I would question whether the assignment allows students to demonstrate effectively what is expected at L5.
3. The quality of students' work, their knowledge and skills (both general and subject-specific) in relation to their peers on comparable programmes elsewhere.
Overall, the quality of the work is of a good standard, with the expected variation of ability and aptitude. It is the case that L4 students appear to be stronger than L5. L4, appear, on average, to be adhering to academic convention, and the strongest among that group appear to demonstrate greater aptitude than the stronger students in L5. A further issue which I inform the team of was in relation to knowledge displayed by students at L5 in the small-scale research module. From my observation of the work, there was very little reference to research methods in a number of assignments, with what there was being very broad and lacking depth. Similarly, the lit review was quite lacking in any analysis or depth. Overall this module lacks clarity as to what it is trying to achieve.

Across both levels there is room for students to use more academic sources. I certainly recognise that encouraging students to do so can be problematic. However, it was noted that at L5 in particular, those students who were being awarded some of the highest grades, above 70 in some cases, were still not using academic sources, or were doing so very sparsely. It is thought that at this level, an assignment above 70 should demonstrate a good use of such sources. As a result, it is the case that some of the assignments with the highest grades might have been awarded a grade which is slightly too high, although in all cases it was agreed that they were the strongest assignments.

At L5 more analysis and interpretation could have been exhibited, again in particular by those students who were awarded the highest grades. In some cases their work exhibited too much description for an assignment at that level to be awarded high grades.

4. The strengths and weaknesses of the students

The strengths of the students included, overall, a broad performance which is comparable to that of other students at this level. In addition, there were some very good examples of applying theory to practice, with some students illustrating very well how to implement the ideas they have been taught.

For weaknesses, see comments in previous section which are applicable.

5. The quality of teaching and learning, as indicated by student performance

Overall, very happy with the quality of teaching. A potential area for enhancement would be to engage more in research methods teaching.

6. The quality of the curriculum, course materials and learning resources

From my knowledge and observations, the quality of the curriculum, course materials and resources are of a good standard.

7. The quality and fairness of the assessments, in particular their:

(i) design and structure

A good variety of assessments. See comments in section 3.

(ii) relation to stated objectives and learning outcomes of the programme

All assessments reflect the learning outcomes, with these learning outcomes being relevant and valid

(iii) marking

A thorough marking process is exhibited, with detailed feedback. It was good to see that feedback included feed forward, and developmental targets.

8. Where the programme has specific work-related learning outcomes (e.g. Foundation Degrees) please comment on the assessment and achievement of these outcomes, including employers' involvement where relevant.

Related to strength illustrated in section 4, the course demonstrates a very good effort to relate theory to practice, with many students exhibiting this.

9. The administration of the assessments, operation of examination boards, briefing of external examiners, access of external examiners to essential materials, etc.

This has been of a very good standard, especially in light of circumstances from March onwards.

10. Have all the issues identified in your previous report been addressed by the institution?

YES/NO – please delete as appropriate

To my knowledge all issues raised have been considered, however, I am not clear as to what level of progress has been made, or to what extent these issues have been considered.

If no, please comment

11. *(For chief external examiners or those with responsibility for the whole programme – if in doubt please check with the appointing institution)*

Please confirm that the assessment and standards set for the programme as a whole, including all its pathways, modules or individual courses are consistent and appropriate, and that the processes for assessment and determination of awards are fair and sound across the provision.

12. Any other comments

Overall, I am very happy with the course, the management of it, and the quality of teaching. Any critical points are few in comparison to the overall positive nature of the programme. I would like to congratulate the team on a successful year, and in particular their efforts since March.

Please ensure that you sign and date below, if sending a hard copy of this report

Signed: Dr David Matthews

Date: 10th August, 2020