

# The University of Leeds

## EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18      QAT Received 25/07/2018

### Part A: General Information

#### Subject area and awards being examined

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

School of Biomedical Sciences

*Subject(s):*

*LEED Modules*

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

LEED1030	Outdoor Adventure – History & Development
LEED1031	Leadership and Teams
LEED1300	Skills in Sports and Outdoor Activities
LEED2004	The LEEDS Award
LEED2009	Teaching and Coaching your People
LEED2012	The Olympic Games – Sport, Education, Business and Culture
LEED2030	Outdoor Adventure – Mapping and Navigation
LEED2031	Outdoor Adventure and Team Building
LEED2042	A Career in PE Teaching
LEED2050	Event Management
LEED2060	Sport Development & Management
LEED2070	Introduction to Strength and Conditioning
LEED3001	Research Development Project
LEED3002	Outdoor Adventure – Land, Water & Air Based Outdoor Activities

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

Discovery Modules

### 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 amount of reflection within assessments is a strength and an area of good practice, particularly for very non-applied academic modes of delivery, said to be the case (by students interviewed from the Leed Modules) at the University of Leeds thus, was cited as a strength for these modules to provide different skills and experiences for students. Reflective practice is also a strength for students to reflect and action plan to aid their professional development for future careers.

Strengths in taking a student led approach to module development is to be commended as well as ensuring staff maintain their contribution so it is co-led, illustrating very good student engagement with curriculum change.

#### Enhancements made from the previous year

*Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.*

There have been numerous enhancements made to the programme and processes from last year including:

A good overview of the 2017/18 changes was provided on the S drive showing a good reflection on the LEED modules and clearly illustrating action from student comments such as the development of 3 new modules which also take account of employability, fitting university strategic areas.

Actions to my External Examiner Report 2016/17 have been implemented and good to see with the refreshing of all Learning Outcomes where I had noted some seemed to more obviously sit in another module.

The Student Feedback: A Guide is also very useful and commendable as good practice.

The Module Handbooks had also been improved with clear assessment briefs.

The Strength and Conditioning Module was very popular so the module team have responded to student requests by running this over both Semester 1 and 2 to cater for the student demand.

Developing a pathway approach from level 1-3 is also something I can see of value to the students and responding to their requests, for example introducing a new strength and conditioning module in 2018/19 to focus on “Supporting the injured athlete” that may encourage more students to progress across the Levels within the LEED portfolio.

The paper that illustrates the changes for the forthcoming academic year: LEED modules: Changes from 2017/18 to 2018/19, is also very useful and commended.

### 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*

### For Examiners in the first year of appointment

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

### For Examiners completing their term of appointment

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

*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)?	N/A

12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y
<p><i>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</i></p> <p>I have agreed this based on a collection of LEED modules as opposed to an overall programme and where refers to programme I have taken this to refer to Modules.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<p><i>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)</i></p> <p>I have put Yes here to refer to where this is included as, given the nature of the applied deliver, there is less research informed teaching than might be seen in solely theoretical modules. Research informed learning and teaching could be strengthened with tutors using more empirical research to inform teaching as well as encouraging students to use more evidence to underpin their work. Continuing the shared working across the academic area of sport and exercise science with the LEED team could also help this as well as, for example, in implementing a Peer Observation of Teaching scheme for staff delivering on the LEED modules with a specific focus on how to enhance research informed teaching.</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i></p>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i></p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i></p> <p>These are individual modules therefore, individual modules could look to achieve external qualifications or PSRB where available.</p>		

### Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<p><i>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.</i></p> <p>Yes at modular level</p>		
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
<p><i>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:</i></p> <p>I would repeat the comments that I made in my 2016/17 report that the overall standard of students' work is broadly comparable with other institutions that I have been external examiner at with similar applied modules, however, there were times where the marks seemed more generous to that I would have awarded. Given this and that it was also noted by the previous external examiner, I would like to see this reflected in the marking of work in 2018/19. The</p>		

work would be strengthened by greater research informed teaching that, as I said last year, can still be done with applied modules also with a high amount of practical content. The wording within the marking criteria could also be enhanced to align more closely with taxonomies for higher education. The work that is planned by the Course Team on Assessment Brief and Criteria Standardisation for the 2018/19 academic year to “ensure that similar assessments and assessment methods follow the same format and ensure that marking, where possible, will be consistent across the LEED portfolio” should help to achieve this.

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

There were some modules that I had not seen the actual assessment title as they are not within the Module Handbooks. I would recommend that the actual assessment titles are put within each Module Handbook and updated as need. For example the Module Handbook would say the assessment would be a presentation rather than say what it was on.

The use of some sources of evidence such as Wikipedia is not normally expected in academic work, particularly in work awarded a first class mark. Again this relates back to the body of work that students are being taught and encouraged to source their work from as well as their own independent literature search.

The feedback on work could be enhanced by the LEED module team taking a consistence stance on this, for example, adding to their Assessment and Marking Policy to state all feedback will provide a positive statement followed by points for improvement (even with work above 70) and ending on a positive comment, in addition to marking on the script, as a way of ensuring consistency of practice. For example, in LEED 1030 there were very little comments on how the students should improve e.g. a 55% mark had only comments around referencing style and a mark of 71 with little additional comments to improve. Within the same module, a mark of 52 was riddled with spelling and grammatical errors that I would have put at 48 as I would have described the work as basic overall. The work that included a presentation could have put more points about the content as comments tended to say more about presentation style in samples viewed.

The university assessment tariff does seem high compared to institutions that I have worked within and examined at working on 4000 words for a 10 credit module. I would be interested to see a review across all types of institutions to see the assessment weighting to ensure comparability.

LEED 1031 again did not actually state the assessment title in the Module rather it states there will be a presentation, a leadership task and essay rather than it being clear exactly what they would be. Similarly, a mark of 71 gave nothing on points to improve other than one thing about student understanding. Feedback could be enhanced by giving more specific points for improvement alongside what was done well. Another illustration of a piece of work where I would have awarded a lower mark was on Korean Sport and their Olympic Committee that did not have an introduction so it was not clear to the reader what it was about or was going to discuss and provided more of an on-going description, whilst this was Level 1 work, I would not have given it a First as there were many errors in essay writing with no introduction, writing in bullet points v paragraphs, and grammatical errors in writing. This is particularly pertinent given that Level 6 students can also take this Level 1 work to count towards their degree classification.

I suggest for the Research Project as a Level 3 piece of work, that the LEED Team should look at turning this into a 20 credit module to allow empirical work to be carried out and to encourage a deeper level of learning as would be expected at this Level.

## 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
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i>		

#### Other comments

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

##### **The student view:**

There were mostly very positive views from the students about all LEED modules when I discussed with them in person as well as in reviewing the Module Evaluation Questionnaires (MEQs). There were some instances within the MEQs where action could be addressed that may happen between now and the start of the next Academic Year. For example, 2070 has most disagree and strongly disagree or no opinion in answer to: Has module information on the VLE been useful and supporting materials and resources. Not all students felt it had so it warrants further investigation for action. Another example was in 1300 where some students did not think the information was readily available to support module choice.

The things that students said they liked the best was having the practical, to be able to put in practice what they learn that was felt to be not something they often had in their core areas of study. They recognised that it was something that was good for job interviews to learn from their practical experience as well as the nature of assessments that require them to produce reflective logs.

What students said they would improve was the promotion of the modules. They described only having found out about the module by chance. One student said they did not know that they could do sport as a Discovery Module as they were in a subject area outside of sport. Students asked whether the LEED modules could be promoted via talks or an email at the start of the year.

There were some queries over assessment raised that related to different practices between the core subject discipline and LEED modules in relation to what was required and illustrated within the assessment criteria, for example, how to format the work or font, and on submission policies. This may well have been made clear to the students but missed by these students however, they are areas worthy of checking to ensure clear in all modules.

One student suggested that if the Course Team promoted the modules to sound like they were 'more academic' that more students would be attracted to them. I think this is a good point also to note as a way of ensuring there is university-wide recognition and promotion of the modules.

**The following student quotes illustrate both the strengths of the modules and teaching team:**

"The learning seems more natural - it's easier to learn as you are emerged in it as you are more interactive which might make it seem easier. If you are just sat in a lecture it's boring."

"The 1:1 talks are very helpful - very limited tutorials in other modules of degree"

Speed of feedback? - "Good and staff are always available. They are really keen to see you and help you."

Academic support? - "All good. They'll read over a paragraph of your work. Feel very approachable."

"The Research Project it's nice you can work it around your own pace. Have to submit something for feedback and 'drop- in' every week by Will meant couldn't go down the wrong track so great to have that."

**Student comments on areas for improvement:**

"Feedback didn't say what to do better - if got that feedback in another module I'd have had more critique"

BB sites - consistent? - "Research development is not that thorough but that's cos there isn't anything taught - Meeting sheets - these could be on the BB site ready for the meetings. Content for others is ok and easy to find."

How do you find the lecture capture? - "Not consistent but not an issue"

"Could do with a workshop on assessment more as it's a very different type of writing [reflective logs]; maybe the issue is if you have students that don't do a LEED module in level 1 and go to Level 2 or 3 the staff should assume the students don't know anything on reflective logs, it would be better. So cover this at each level."

**General Comment:**

I would like to thank \_\_\_\_\_ for all on-going support in the administrative arrangements of External Examining as well as the Course Team for their hospitality on the day and in providing a lot of very useful documents in advance to enable a comprehensive view of all documentation to be given, in addition to organising a diverse group of students across a good range of LEED Modules.

The success of the LEED modules is also illustrated by a notable increase in student numbers giving all credit to the work of the whole team.

**Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)***Title and Name of Examiner:*

Subject(s):

Programme(s) / Module(s):

LEED Modules

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

*Title and Name of Responder:*

Position\*:

Professional Development Manager, Sport and Physical Activity

Faculty / School of:

Biological 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 are pleased that you have highlighted the amount of reflection within assessments as a particular strength and an area of good practice. We promote our modules as a way of students getting more out of their degree and as a way of preparing them for their careers beyond, with reflection being a core tool. We also welcome your praise for the student-led way that our portfolio has been developed. We aim to continue this successful strategy in the years to come.

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

We have worked hard to enhance the LEED portfolio with more changes made recently than in previous years. Module creation, expansion and reduction have been instigated with a number of driving factors including: student demand; employability; service expertise; development of a pathway approach; and university policy. As part of our curriculum review, learning outcomes of the majority of our modules have recently been re-evaluated and, in the forthcoming year, we plan to do the same for the remaining modules. We agree that the paper "LEED modules: Changes from 2017/18 to 2018/19" is a useful summary tool and shall aim to produce this annually.

**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:*



n/a

**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:*

n/a

**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:*

Further developing research-lead teaching within the modules is an area that we have identified in-house and working in partnership with the Sport Science department. As our module portfolio changes, we are making a concerted effort to balance the practical nature of our modules with a research-led approach to our teaching. Our new module for 2018/19, LEED 1201 provides an excellent example of how we are taking this work forward.

We are also working a lot more closely with Sport Science to ensure that our portfolio meets some of the points made in the report. This includes our modules being approved via their Programme Approval Group and working with colleagues to develop module content, outcomes and assessments.

**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:*

A key work area for 2018/19 identified as part of the LEED Annual Review 2017/18 is the standardisation of all LEED module assessment briefs and criteria for assessment. The aim here is to ensure that similar assessments and assessment methods follow the same format and ensure that marking, where possible will be consistent across our portfolio. It was planned that much of this work would cover many of the aspects that you have highlighted, but in response to particular points raised, we shall also amend our assessment briefs to take on board your suggestion about use of Wikipedia as a source of evidence in academic work. We also embrace the idea that, in addition to annotating scripts, LEED should adopt an Assessment and Marking Policy to state that all feedback should aim to provide a positive statement followed by points for improvement (even with work above 70) and ending on a positive comment, as a way of ensuring consistency of practice. With greater scrutiny of the marking framework we anticipate that there would be less scope for errant marks at either end of the spectrum and better opportunity more balanced feedback on presentations.

Putting all assessment titles in the module handbooks is an excellent idea and something that we were moving towards along with reviewing assessment type titles (eg Reflective Log V Reflective Essay).

Following discussion of your suggestion to review the assessment tariff across all types of institutions to ensure comparability, we have decided that as an initial step we should do this within the University. There are assessment committees and structures in place to ensure comparability, so we don't expect to discover significant discrepancies. However, we acknowledge that it is good practice to perform checks to ensure consistency of approach and thereby protect the value of a University of Leeds undergraduate degree.



We think that there is considerable merit in your suggestion that LEED3001 be turned into a 20 credit module to allow empirical work to be carried out and a deeper level of learning encouraged, and have decided to feed this into our ongoing review and development of our pathway approach.

## 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:*

With the expansion of some, and the addition/rationalisation of others of our modules, we are paying particular attention to further improving the quality and consistency of supporting materials and resources available to students on the VLE. Work on this started early in the summer and will be completed by the beginning of the 2018/19 academic session. Consistency of placing all materials and regular sign-posting of them should be a robust approach and we recognise that we have room for improvement here. However, information about our Code of Practice on Assessment (COPA), for example, is currently available to students in a consistent place across all our modules, and reference made to it in lectures and tutorials when outlining assessment requirements, so there should be no confusion about our assessment requirements should they differ from students' home schools. We shall continue our efforts here, perhaps looking at novel ways of signposting.

We have been extremely fortunate in receiving a massive boost to the marketing of our modules for the 2018/19 session, with updated flyers, new pop-up banners for recruitment fairs and a marketing video which is available with full audio on our website <https://sport.leeds.ac.uk/modules/> and a sub-titled version for use on the large plasma screens situated around the university. These resources have been live since the beginning of July and have already proved themselves to be extremely useful marketing tools. In May we made other subtle changes to the University Catalogue, so that a link to the above website now features prominently in the summary information for each module. Cumulatively, these improvements now ensure much better visibility of the full LEED portfolio.

On the comment raised regarding reflective writing skills (and particularly because reflection is a core tool and particular strength, as highlighted in your initial section on "Points of innovation and/or good practice"), we would like to reassure you that each LEED module, regardless of level, assumes no prior knowledge. We will continue to review the timing of input on reflective writing in each of our modules, assuming no prior knowledge and continue this strategy regardless of our aim to have a clear pathway for the specialisms we provide from level one to level three. This will ensure that development of a pathway approach remains compatible with our ethos of ease of accessibility of our broad portfolio.

## Other comments

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

Please see above.