

# The University of Leeds

## EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 12/07/2018

### Part A: General Information

#### Subject area and awards being examined

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

Faculty of Biological Sciences (School of Biomedical Sciences) – Sport and Exercise Sciences

*Programme(s) / Module(s):*

Sports Science and Physiology  
 Sports Science and Physiology (Industrial)  
 Sports Science and Physiology (International)  
 Sports Science in Relation to Medicine  
 Sports Science and Physiology (Integrated Masters)  
 Sports Science and Physiology (Integrated Masters)(International)

*Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):*

BSc and MSci

### Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards

#### Points of innovation and/or good practice

*Please highlight areas of innovation or good practice within the programmes or processes you have been involved with in this box.*  
 The variety and blend of theoretical and practical modules across numerous sport and exercise science sub-disciplines provides a relevant and stimulating learning experience for the students across the levels. The staff are student-centred and the support for students is excellent. It is important for students to experience modules that provide in-depth insight of health and sports performance – this is achieved via the suite of core and optional modules utilising the expertise and experience of the staff effectively. It is clear that the learning and teaching team modify the modules annually to optimise provision.

The administration by \_\_\_\_\_ and the team, and the support provided by \_\_\_\_\_ is excellent.

#### Enhancements made from the previous year

*Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.*  
 Given the standards have been consistently high over my three-year term of office to date, this is increasingly difficult to identify. Nevertheless, there is consistent evidence, via tweaks in content, delivery methods and assessments that the modules are continually evolving. Furthermore, I am impressed with the strong relationship the staff and students share, which allows refinement of module components that align better with contemporary sport and exercise science practice.

#### Matters for Urgent Attention

*If there are any areas which you think require urgent attention before the programme is offered again please note them in this box*

I urge all staff to type feedback (feedforward) notes whenever an MS Word template is used – handwritten feedback is often difficult or impossible to decipher. Note: this does not apply to annotations on examination papers nor on essays or projects - I am referring to the use of standardised templates.

#### For Examiners in the first year of appointment

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Handbook?	Y
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses to these?	N/A
3.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Mentor?	N/A

**For Examiners completing their term of appointment**

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	
7.	Have you acted as an External Examiner Mentor?	

*Please comment on your experience of the programme(s) over the period of your appointment, remarking in particular on changes from year to year and the progressive development and enhancement of the learning and teaching provision, on standards achieved, on marking and assessment and the procedures of the School*

**Standards**

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	Y
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Y
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y

*Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.*

The intended learning outcomes for the programmes and modules were appropriate, as were the structure and content of the programmes. The paperwork was very clear. The standards were appropriate for the award and award element. A varied range of appropriate assessment methods were evident across and within the levels; they were well-matched to the intended learning outcomes. All samples of work I examined was marked and moderated independently – the classifications were entirely appropriate and all border-line students were dealt with appropriately and consistently, with the students' best academic interest at the forefront of decisions. Student performance suggests the teaching, learning and assessment methods are of a high standard. This is the same as last year.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
-----	---	---

*Please explain how this is/could be achieved (examples might include: curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research)*

It is already being achieved as indicated in my report last year and this is still evident.

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
-----	--	---

*Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:*

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
-----	--	---

*Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:*

16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
-----	--	---

*Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:*

**Assessment and Feedback**

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
-----	---	---

*Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs, in particular: the design and structure of the assessment methods, and the arrangements for the marking of modules and the classification of awards; the quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods that may be indicated by student performance.*

The range, level and standard of assessments are excellent and well aligned with the ILOs. The classification of awards is fair, transparent and applied consistently across all students. The impact of any industrial action was minimal and dealt with appropriately. Last year, I commented on the number of first class grades/awards and several module leaders commented on the reduction in the number of students achieving at the upper end of the range this year.

18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y

*Please comment on the academic standards demonstrated by the students and, where possible, their performance in relation to students on comparable courses; the strengths and weaknesses of the students as a cohort:*

Yes, this was evident in all the modules I examined; however, the proportion of students gaining 1<sup>st</sup> class honours awards may be lower than other institutions that I am aware of. The staff may wish to examine whether they are using the full range of marks or if the current cohort were just not as strong as previous years.

*Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:*

Please refer to previous comment concerning typewritten feedback/forward in standardised templates. Other than this, I have no concerns about assessment and feedback, which is a very high standard.

### The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiner's role, powers and responsibilities in the examination process?	Y
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Y
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y

35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>The conduct of the awards board meeting was exemplary – thank you to _____ and _____</p>		

**Other comments**

**Please use this box if you wish to make any further comments not covered elsewhere on the form**

Given the standard of provision is so high, I apologise that much of my report is similar to last year, but it not always possible to identify significant differences from year to year.

## Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report

### Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Subject(s):*

*Sports Science and Physiology, Sports Science in Relation to Medicine*

*Programme(s) / Module(s):*

BSc, MSc Sports Science and Physiology  
BSc Sports Science in Relation to Medicine

*Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):*

BSc/MSc

*Title and Name of Responder:*

*Position\*:*

Programme leader – BSc, MSc Sports Science and Physiology

*Faculty / School of:*

*Faculty of Biological Sciences/ School of Biomedical Sciences*

*Address for communication:*

*Email:*

*Telephone:*

*\*If the individual responding to the report is not the Head of School please state their position within the School.*

### Completing the School response

The completed School response (including the full original report) should be attached to an e-mail and sent to the Pro-Dean for Student Education in the relevant Faculty. Following approval by the Pro-Dean for Student Education, the School must send the response (including the full original report) directly to the External Examiner. A copy must also be emailed to the Quality Assurance Team at [gat@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:gat@leeds.ac.uk). External Examiners should receive a formal response no later than six weeks after receipt of the original report.

#### **Response to Points of innovation and/or good practice**

We would again like to thank you for supportive comments regarding our programme. In particular, we appreciate the comment that you found that the support for our students is excellent, and that through reflecting regularly on our programme we modify modules repeatedly to optimise provision.

#### **Response to Enhancements made from the previous year**

We appreciate the supportive comments made here regarding the consistent high standards of our programme. Continual evolution of our programme content and delivery is something we as a team work hard at to ensure we maintain these high standards.

#### **Response to Matters for Urgent Attention**

*If any areas have been identified for urgent attention before the programme is offered again please provide a specific response to them here:*

We understand the concern regarding handwritten feedback. We will work with our teaching and admin teams with the aim of providing typed feedback on our standard MS Word templates or via Grademark, as appropriate, from the next academic session, subject to Programme group approval.

#### **Response to questions 1-7 (and related comments)**

*Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:*

That you very much again for your supportive and encouraging comments.

## Standards

### **Response to questions 8 to 16 (and related comments)**

*Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:*

The overall standard of our programme is something we work hard to maintain and improve. Therefore we greatly appreciate these supportive comments.

## Assessment and Feedback

### **Response to questions 17 to 19 (and related comments)**

*Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:*

We understand that handwritten feedback/ feedforward is a limitation, and an area that we can improve upon. It is our goal as a teaching team to provide further typed feedback/ feedforward on our standard MS Word templates or via Grademark as appropriate from next academic session onwards. Other options have been tested including the increased use of oral feedback and this is of course routinely provided in academic tutorial sessions helping ensure clarity and accessibility to our feedback. Additionally the institute is investigating other means of increasing use of electronic feedback which are likely to be implemented over the next 2-3 years.

Using the full grading scale and, when appropriate, the upper end in particular, is something that we are mindful of as a programme team. The distribution of classifications this year was not significantly different from previous years, although we are aware that elsewhere in the sector the distribution of classifications can be somewhat different. We will continue to be mindful of this moving forward and this will be part of discussions that we have as we review our portfolio of assessments, assessment templates and marking criteria.

## The Progression and Awards Process

### **Response to questions 20-35 (and related comments)**

*Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:*

Thank you for your supportive comments.

## Other comments

### **Response to items included in the 'Other Comments' section of the report**

Thank you for your supportive, encouraging and constructive comments both in this year's report and in the previous 2 years. These are very much appreciated, and we will use these to continue the development of our programme.