

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT Received 02/07/2019

**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)

*Subject(s):*

Sport and Exercise Sciences

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

BSc Sports Science and Physiology – all programme variants;  
MSci, BSc Sports Science and Physiology (Integrated Masters) – all programme variants;  
BSc Sports Science in Relation to Medicine.

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

MSci / BSc

**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 level of fundamental or basic science in the programmes is a unique feature of provision – this is blended into modules that enable the students to use this strong foundation knowledge to demonstrate their ability to apply the science to sports performance and a variety of health/disease conditions. The changes to part A (BSc year 1) have strengthened the programmes and are operating well – I am confident planned changes to parts B and C will further strengthen the programmes.

approach is transparent and results in outcomes that are student-centred and fair; her work in this role is exemplary. and the administrative team provide outstanding support.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

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

The standards have been high from the outset; I am impressed with the smooth transition of the new part A modules.

**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*

Whilst it is clear that feedback for some modules is completely type-written (where standardised Word templates are used), it is disappointing that others have resisted change for the four years that I have recommended hand-written feedback should be provided on Word templates because it is easier for the students to read it (not exam scripts nor oral presentations). It is not always clear when coursework and exams have been moderated and the process for agreeing the final project mark varies. I recommend a coursework and examination moderation proforma is used to provide greater transparency of the process - this should be designed so that the process for staff is not a burden but does provide external examiners with a clear indication of the outcomes. For the projects, I recommend the mean of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> marker grades is the agreed grade given to the students (providing they are within the predetermined level of agreement) – giving the students the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and agreed marks may lead to appeals.

**For Examiners in the first year of appointment only**

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

**For Examiners completing their term of appointment only**

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	Y
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

*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*

When I started in 2015, the programmes were already operating very well, with strong staff and students – this is still clearly evident. Most changes have been subtle, but effective – the recent revamp of part A modules has been successful and planned changes at parts B and C are likely to enhance the programmes further. My Y & N responses above relate to my previous comment about hand-written feedback on feedback/forward proformas.

**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 there was some evidence it had been moderated – 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
<i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i>		

### 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>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 proportion of "good honours degrees" (1<sup>st</sup> and 2i) is similar to comparable Universities offering similar programmes.</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>This was evident and comparable with students on similar programmes elsewhere. On some modules, higher grades were evident this year.</p>		
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i>		

### 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 process is completely transparent and all decisions were fair and appropriate – conduct of the Board is exemplary. Thanks to the _____ for excellent leadership and _____ (including the administrative team) for the excellent support.</p>		

#### Other comments

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

I have thoroughly enjoyed my role of external examiner at the University of Leeds – the standard of provision is excellent.

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

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

*Sports Science and Physiology*

Programme(s) / Module(s):

BSc Sports Science and Physiology – all programme variants;  
MSci, BSc Sports Science and Physiology (Integrated Masters) – all programme variants;  
BSc Sports Science in Relation to Medicine.

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

MSci / BSc

Title and Name of Responder:

Position\*:

Programme leader 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) must be sent 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**

Thank you for your continued support of our programme, and for highlighting the strength and the uniqueness of the extensive basic/ fundamental science background on which our programme is based. We were also encouraged by your positive comments that the changes we have made, specifically to the physiology provision in Level 1, have strengthened our programme, and that our proposed changes at Level 2 and L3 will continue this trend.

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

Thank you for your supportive comments, particularly regarding the introduction of our new L1 physiology modules.

**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:

**Typed Feedback:** We appreciate your concerns regarding hand-written feedback sheets. While we have made moves towards typed feedback/ feedforward sheets for some assessments/ modules, we understand your disappointment that we have not yet been able to implement this for all modules across the programme. We agreed at our recent programme group away-day that we would have typed feedback (via word or Grademark) in place for all modules with appropriately assessed coursework this coming academic year and are in the process of working with staff and our student support team to convert all our marking criteria into a rubric that can be used within Grademark. Therefore, we are confident that we should be in a position to report that this has been addressed by this time next year.

**Moderation/ Check-marking:** We apologise that it is not always clear when coursework and exams have been moderated. This work is moderated, and we follow our code of practice for assessment (COPA) procedure, with check markers required to sign the script, if they agree with the primary markers grade (+/- 5%). We will remind staff through our programme meeting that check markers should sign the scripts that they have check-marked, following the procedures outlined in our COPA. We are also investigating whether a clear prompt and check of this step can be added to our marking instruction sheet. For project marks, we also follow our COPA procedures, where the numerical mean is given as the final mark when markers agree within 10%. When project marks disagree by more than 10%, as stated in our COPA, markers meet to discuss and agree a mark. If there is no agreement following this discussion, a 3<sup>rd</sup> marker is brought in. However, as suggested, we will now only give students the primary marker feedback sheet with final (agreed) mark.

**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:*

Thank you for your positive feedback regarding our programme and recently implemented/ proposed changes. In response to the specific points about hand-written feedback/ feedforward, we have made a move towards this for all coursework in this academic session. However, as described above we should be in a position where this is in place for the majority of coursework this coming academic year.

**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:*

We work hard as a team to maintain the high standards of our programme, and therefore appreciate this positive feedback. We particularly appreciate this positive feedback at a time when we have been making significant changes to our programme to ensure that we continue to improve the overall standard and attractiveness of our degree.

**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:*

Thank you for your encouraging comments regarding assessment and feedback.

**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:*

We appreciate your supportive comments regarding our processes.

**Other comments**

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

Thank you very much for all your support and constructive feedback which has been really helpful in developing our programme over the last 4 years.