



The Open
University

**Centre for Inclusion and Collaborative
Partnerships (CICP)**

External Examiner report template

Section A: General information

Institution:	Leeds City College
Programme:	FD & BA (Hons) Leadership & Management
Subject examined:	Leadership and Management
Name of examiner:	David Goodman
Current year of appointment	2021

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.
The range of assessed material was sound. This included reports, presentation slide packs, case studies and video recorded professional conversations/presentations. The sample, across all modules delivered, included a sufficient range of marks to establish that marking and the banding is in line with other institutions and national standards.
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.
Standards used within the programme are appropriate and are in line with the subject benchmark for Business and Management.
3. The quality of students' work, their knowledge and skills (both general and subject-specific) in relation to their peers on comparable programmes elsewhere.
FdA: The performance within the FdA has steadily improved across both level 4 and 5. Part time student work is of high quality and reflects my own experience of teaching similar students. BA(Hons): There are a number of L6 students who have clearly struggled this year. However, reflecting on their performance in previous years suggests this should not be completely unexpected when added to the impact of COVID. I understand the team will be meeting to explore a plan for resits etc. At the top end of marking there is some excellent work submitted by the students, especially within the part time cohort. Overall, the range of student performance is comparable with other institutions.
4. The strengths and weaknesses of the students
Strengths: As noted above part time students seem to be performing better (although fewer in number). I suspect this may be related to their experience of work and while some of the

full-time student appear to have part time jobs these seem to be at a lower level. It may be a challenge for staff to draw out meaningful experience from some job roles but in some part time students this has been done well.

In previous years I have raised concern of the engagement with more valid and reliable sources towards building theoretical ideas and propositions. I think progress is being made and where there are weaker students, I note some clear feedback signposting this in the marking sheets.

There is continued progress within the dissertations. This year there have been some very strong literature reviews however there are still some confused sections on methodology. I have discussed with the course lead and some ideas for development are being explored.

Weaknesses:

As previously noted, the weaker students generally demonstrate less understanding of academic practice, both in terms of writing and presentation but my sense of the whole is this number of weaker students is reducing. Staff continue to be pro-active in developing student practice and I saw evidence of this in some of the presentation/discussion video content.

As noted above the L6 have struggled in terms of engagement.

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

The enthusiasm and energy of the course leader and team is clear, and I was able to meet the course leader before the exam board to briefly discuss this year's work. As the team has grown my sense is the provision has developed and strengthened. As this challenging year ends, I hope there can be more opportunities to develop staff in terms of scholarship, research and teaching practice.

Feedback is consistent and there is some helpful 'feed forward'.

The course team continue to use a range of authentic assessment methods: professional conversations, group discussions, and role play. Their approach should be commended in using these activities.

I would like to commend the team for developing the confidence to use a full mark range. It might be worth using a team meeting to 'workshop' the use of the 70 plus range and share practice and perspective on when to award 80s and 90s. I am not explicitly concerned about the higher marks awarded this year, but I advise some reflection would be helpful.

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

This year I was unable to directly view content in Google Classroom but the range of curriculum is evident within student work. Notwithstanding minor comments above the

overall structure of the programme is sound.
7. The quality and fairness of the assessments, in particular their:
(i) design and structure
The assessment strategy remains good. Each module, except the dissertation, has two assessments which typically contrast, this provides students opportunities to respond in different 'modes'. For example, a report and a professional conversation. The development of diverse assessments is to be encouraged and it is positive to see a range of activity including 'Dragons Den', group presentations, professional conversations, case study, reports and 'Mystery Shopper'. As noted, this provides a range of 'authentic' activities reflecting the workplace.
(ii) relation to stated objectives and learning outcomes of the programme
Good. In addition, this relationship is typically reinforced within the feedback.
(iii) marking
Good. Marking schemes are applied well. A full range of marks are applied.
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.
The work based learning module has improved this year. My sense is there is still a challenge for full time FdA students, in this year's sample there were some topic choices which I suspect students did not fully understand. Possibly some earlier formative feedback or even a 'gateway' approval early process in the module might help. The part time students appear to gain a greater buy-in from employers and produced some very interesting (and strong) submissions, for example the impact of electric cars on 'traditional' garages.
9. The administration of the assessments, operation of examination boards, briefing of external examiners, access of external examiners to essential materials, etc.
Administration of assessment: the course leader provided all the written work and non-written assessment, such as the videos of professional discussions in a timely and suitable online format. The media content, videos and online recordings are captured well via the online system. Operation of Exam Board: very good. Briefing: very good. Access: very good
10. Have all the issues identified in your previous report been addressed by the institution?
Yes. There is clear incremental progress and development within the course and department.
If no, please comment
11. <i>(For chief external examiners or those with responsibility for the whole programme – if in doubt please check with the appointing institution)</i> 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.

I can confirm for the FD Leadership and Management and BA (Hons) Leadership and Management modules 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

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

Signed:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. P. ...', written over a horizontal line.

Date:

23/06/2021