

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:	Leeds University Business School
Subject(s):	<i>Marketing</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	LUBS5210M Marketing Management, LUBS 5250M Management Dissertation (Marketing), LUBS 5251M Project/Dissertation (marketing area), LUBS 5410M Marketing Strategy (including August), LUBS 5422 Consumer Behaviour Across Cultures, LUBS 5465M Marketing strategy (inc. August), LUBS5495M Dissertation, LUBS5748 Marketing Management, inc. August, LUBS5755 Sales Management, LUBS 5776M Global Marketing, LUBS 5799M MBA projects (marketing area), and LUBS 5851M Marketing
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MSc International Marketing Management, MA Advertising and Marketing, MSc Management, MBA and Executive MBA.

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

There are no serious issues for concern that need bringing to your attention.

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?

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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.*

The intended outcomes and standards are challenging and realistically appropriate for students at this level.

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 programmes for which I am examiner for several modules compare favourably to other institutions and meet the standards of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications.

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.*

Staff design and develop a range of assessments that are applicable at this level. Much of the work is applied but requiring a sound theoretical underpinning. There is a useful supportive infrastructure to facilitate learning outside the classroom. Feedback is often demonstrated through a detailed profile analysis.

Although comments made are usually appropriate, I believe feedback from a few staff is too general and I suspect the profile analysis might encourage this. Many staff made additional effort to report on how good pieces of work can be improved in very specific areas.

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.*

Statistical distributions reveal a good spread of marks with a high proportion achieving very good grades. Considering the international mix of students at LUBS, their performance probably exceeds that at institutions of a similar composition. This is clearly a credit to the staff which I reiterate.

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

Not strictly applicable.

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.

I have found over my three years that staff are eager to correspond with me and reply to any comments I make in module questions, assignments, or grading.

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 range of research methods used is most evident in projects and dissertations, and surely must reflect the expertise of supervisory support.

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

Although I recently agreed to take on this role, I have yet to be approached by any staff.

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.*

As I mentioned in last year's report, I found the guideline dates for external roles to be particularly helpful. Generally the procedures and organisation at LUBS enable me to act in an unrestricted way. However, the aims of the module reports seem to be somewhat uncertain.

The module reports invite externals to make adjustments to module marks should they feel the need to do so. However the closeness between examining and the Exam Boards (usually Externals arrive the day before) makes this somewhat impractical to administer. As a corollary, I have never considered an external's role to alter the marks of a sample of scripts since it would invite the retaliatory response that the entire batch should be subjected to a similar process. I mention this only because you may wish to revise what you need from the module reports.

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.*

The administrative team are very reliable with respect to both communication and documentation. There are no nasty surprises. Thank you!

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?

I believe that all exam papers / assessments were forwarded for comments. In all cases, administrative support has also encouraged me to make comments on module assessments throughout the year. These comments generally sought clarification to a question, or to guidance on the supportive role given to students. I was generally satisfied with the replies I received.

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?

I had sufficient time to review the samples of scripts and projects allocated to me. There was evidence to suggest consistent marking throughout the majority of work sampled. My caveat is that some staff appear reluctant to make sufficient comments on scripts. This sometimes makes it more difficult for external examiners to understand the viewpoint of the internal examiner. Perhaps a need to benchmark the best practice could be suggested?

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

The topics chosen for dissertations were very apt, offering ample opportunity for students to excel. Students were advised on how they were marked, with methods and assessment standards appropriate at this level.

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?

The administrative arrangements were excellent. I attended the Board of Examiners which ran very smoothly. I was satisfied with the recommendations of the Board.

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

Where mitigating circumstances emerged, the Board gave ample consideration to each student. I believe this was performed with fairness.

Other comments

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

No further comments necessary.

<>

04 March 2013

Dear <>,

Thank you for the recent report. We appreciate your comments on assessment, dissertations, the high quality of teaching and the high standard of work produced from our international mix of students, together with the professionalism and dedication of our staff.

In relation to feedback on assessed work, we have attempted to address your comments from last year and feel progress has been achieved but note your points about generality in a few cases and the need for more comments on exam scripts and will highlight these at the next divisional learning and teaching meeting. We also note your comments about the detail of module reports and examiner capacity to change marks. This is a central policy and we will forward your comments.

We welcome the positive comments you have made about the programme as a whole both in your report and your deliberations at the Examination Board. We will always take your constructive suggestions into account with a view to enhance student experience on the programme.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

<>

Dean, Leeds University Business School