

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2011– 2012

Part A: General Information**Subject area and awards being examined**

Faculty / School of:	LUBS
Subject(s):	Management and related single and joint programmes
Programme(s) / Module(s):	LUBS 0070, 1090, 1170, 1885, 2020, 2150, 2660, 3004, 3070, 3080.
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BA

Completed report

The completed report should be attached to an e-mail and sent as soon as possible, and no later than six weeks after the relevant meeting of the Board of Examiners, to exexadmin@leeds.ac.uk.

Alternatively you can post your report to: **Head of Academic Quality and Standards**
Academic Quality and Standards Team
Room 12:81, EC Stoner Building
The University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT

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

None

Only applicable in first year of appointment

Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?

N/A

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

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

N/A

Standards

1. Please indicate the extent to which the programme Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) were commensurate with the level of the award

- *The appropriateness of the Intended Learning Outcomes for the programme(s)/modules and of the structure and content of the programme(s);*
- *The extent to which standards are appropriate for the award or award element under consideration.*

Aims, Intended Learning Outcomes, and the structure and content of the programmes are commensurate to the level of the award

2. Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?

- *The comparability of the programme(s) with similar programme(s) at other institutions and against national benchmarks and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications.*

The Aims and ILO's are comparable to those of similar institutions.

3. Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs

- *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.*

Assessment methods vary from module to module. Many use traditional methods, particularly exams, but Assessment instruments are appropriate to Learning Outcomes. Some modules have taken the opportunity to use online logs - in the digital age further development of such methods is to be welcomed.

Standards of marking guidance vary, and a little more detail would occasionally help particularly where there are more than one marker in a team. However, there are good processes in place for moderation, and it was pleasing to see the care that was taken to support 'new' markers and to ensure consistency of standards for students.

4. Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the Aims and ILOs?

- *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.*

Marks were generally good and show good conceptual understanding of the subject areas. There is a broad spread of marks which gives confidence in the structure of the teaching and assessment in allowing for sufficient differentiation. Case studies allow for some application of concepts to practice. There is opportunity to develop application through greater practical involvement with organisations.

5. For Examiners responsible for programmes that include clinical practice components, please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum

N/A

6. Please comment on the nature and effectiveness of enhancements to the programme(s) and modules since the previous year

It would be particularly helpful if you could also identify areas of good practice which are worthy of wider dissemination.

These are mature modules and as marks are reasonably strong seem, in general, to be developing appropriately.

7. Please comment on the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching

This may include examples of curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research.

The currency of the content of the modules isn't in question. There are examples of group work which engage students in conducting research in a practical sense.

For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements

8. If you have acted as a mentor to a new External Examiner or have received mentor support please comment here on the arrangements

N/A

The Examination/Assessment Process

9. The University and its Schools provide guidance for External Examiners as to their roles, powers and responsibilities. Please indicate whether this material was sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner.

- *Whether External Examiners have sufficient access to the material needed to make the required judgements and whether they are encouraged to request additional information.*

The material provided for me was sufficient to enable me to fulfil the requirements of the role.

10. Did you receive appropriate documentation relating to the programmes and/or parts of programmes for which you have responsibility, e.g. programme specifications or module handbooks, marking criteria?

- *The coherence of the policies and procedures relating to External Examiners and whether they match the explicit roles they are asked to perform.*

Yes, I received appropriate documentation.

11. Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments? Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate? If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

Yes, the process was sound.

12. Was sufficient assessed / examined work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work? Were the scripts clearly marked/annotated?

Yes, the range of work provided was sufficient for me to be able to have confidence in my evaluation of the standards. Any queries I had were dealt with promptly. However, the turnaround times are very tight, samples arriving very close to Board dates. It may be appropriate to reconsider the turnaround times for marking to be completed and then forwarded to externals, or to review the process of external moderation, to make sure that there is sufficient time for proper scrutiny prior to the Boards.

13. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate? Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

N/A

14. Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Board of Examiners? Were you able to attend the meeting? Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board?

I wasn't able to attend the meeting of the Board of Examiners, but am happy with the process apart from the issue of timeliness outlined above.

15. Were appropriate procedures in place to give due consideration to mitigating circumstances and medical evidence?

I did not attend the Board, but received paperwork relating to some mitigating circumstances that give me confidence that due consideration was given.

Other comments

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

Leeds University Business School

Maurice Keyworth Building
University of Leeds
Leeds LS2 9JT



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

3 September 2012

Dear

Reference: External Examination Report 2011-12

Thank you for your report as external examiner for the academic year 2011-12 in respect of the Management programmes.

I am pleased to note that you welcome the development of new assessment instruments and further encourage colleagues to develop such methods of assessment.

With regards to your comment that the standards of marking guidance vary, the School is looking to develop some internal moderation documentation which we will share with our external examiners in due course. Please accept my apologies for the late provision of some scripts and the resulting tight turnaround, there were a number of unforeseen circumstances which impacted upon the turnaround of work this year; these were, unfortunately, outside of the control of the School.

We are considering ways to improve the experience of being an external examiner in the School and we are considering inviting our externals to the School on the day before the Examination Board to allow you dedicated time to consult the scripts and marks. We would of course cover your expenses and accommodation costs for this and would appreciate your comments on whether you feel this would be a sensible proposal. We hope that it will help to alleviate some of the issues with the tight turn around experienced this year.

On behalf of the Division may I again thank you for your suggestions and for you positive comments on our modules, our programmes, and our examining. We greatly appreciate the assistance you have given to us, and I look forward to meeting you once more at this year's examination board.

Yours sincerely

Dean, Leeds University Business School