

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:	Law
Subject(s):	Various
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Various
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	Various

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

N/A

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.*

The programme aims and ILOs were entirely appropriate.

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.*

As noted above, the programme aims and ILOs were entirely appropriate.

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.*

The assessments methods were carefully mapped onto the ILOs.

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.*

Yes – the assessments were entirely appropriate.

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.

N/A

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.

There was clear evidence of research-led teaching (particularly in the obligations family of modules).

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.*

Yes.

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 – documentation was very helpful.

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 – a very constructive process which engaged me as an external examiner.

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.

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

Yes – and I reviewed some excellent dissertations.

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?

All exemplary and once again I would like to thank to administrative team in the School for their efficient and professional approach.

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

Yes – very clearly.

Other comments

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

N/A

<<>>

2 October 2012

Dear <>

I am writing to formally acknowledge receipt of your external examiner's report for the 2011-12 academic year and to thank you for the many positive comments you have made about our teaching and assessment practices.

We are currently reviewing our undergraduate programmes and have noted carefully the comments you have made about the degree of fit between learning outcomes and assessments and also research-led teaching. In enhancing our curriculum we, of course, are seeking to retain current good practice and we are grateful to you for identifying these strengths within our provision.

Thank you also for your comments in relation to how you have found the administrative process attached to external examining at Leeds. We work hard to ensure our examiners are provided with as smooth an administrative experience as possible so that you are able to concentrate your attention to the assessments themselves.

Again, many thanks for your contribution to our assessment processes.

Yours sincerely

<>

Head of School

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:	Law
Subject(s):	
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Module Law 2284 – Advanced Legal Research and Law Reform
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	LLB

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.*

Both the learning outcomes and the standards for the module for which I was external examiner were appropriate. The module fits into a coherent programme.

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.*

Yes

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.*

My comments from last year about the importance of this module to students in developing research skills still apply. This year a change was made to allow students to write about only one article – whereas in previous years the students had a choice. While I can understand the need to ensure that all students can demonstrate the learning outcomes I am also conscious of the value of giving students an element of choice in assessment in particular to choose to write about an article in an area of law they have more interest in. This is something the module team might like to consider further.

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.*

There was at the top of the marks some excellent work, which was appropriately awarded. In general the spread of marks was as I would expect for a compulsory subject. At the bottom end some students clearly still struggle with this module, although these marks were often compounded by late hand-in penalties – suggesting these are generally weak and disorganised students.

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.

I am aware that the practice of this module has been written up for inclusion in a book published this year.

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.

See comment from last year.

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.*

This material was effective.

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. Although see comment in next box in relation to oral assessment.

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 I was provided with draft assessments and the nature and level of the question was appropriate. However, there seems to have been an element of oral contribution which was included in the overall mark for the module. I have not received any information or criteria in relation to this.

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.

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 was unable to attend the Board this year, so cannot comment on this.

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

I was unable to attend the Board this year, so cannot comment on this.

Other comments

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

<<>>

2 October 2012

Dear <>

I am writing to formally acknowledge receipt of your external examiner's report for the 2011-12 academic year and to thank you for the comments you made. The School of Law values very much both the supportive comments and advice you offer with regard to how our processes may be improved

Thank you also for your comments in relation to how you have found the administrative process attached to external examining at Leeds. We work hard to ensure our examiners are provided with as smooth an administrative experience as possible so that you are able to concentrate your attention to the assessments themselves.

I note that you were not provided with sufficient information about the oral contribution and the criteria upon which it is assessed. This issue will be followed up by the Director of Student Education (<>) and the module convenor for 2012-13 (<>).

We are currently reviewing our undergraduate programmes and our approach to assessments will be reviewed as part of this process. Your comments about the importance of providing students with a choice of assessment will certainly form a valuable part of that discussion.

Again, many thanks for your contribution to our assessment processes.

Yours sincerely,

<>

Head of School

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:	Law
Subject(s):	<i>LAW</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	LLB Modules Introduction to Company Law; Company Law; Discrimination Law; Employment Law; Dissertations; Banking and Financial Services Law; Insurance and Risk Management
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	LLB

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

No

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 – final year appointment

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

I strongly commend the undergraduate law programme.

The Department is clearly committed to the highest standards in teaching and assessment.

I was impressed with the quality of the student performance. The first class students in particular are operating at a very high level. In particular, I found the Dissertations to be of a very impressive quality.

Assessment materials are imaginative and supportive of student development. I was particularly impressed by the quality of feedback provided, particularly in essays, which shows a strong commitment to student development. The combined essay/examination approach seemed to allow strong students to shine, but to allow weaker students to strengthen their performance across two modes of assessment.

I was also impressed with the care taken with new/part-time lecturers – ie the mentoring system which applied to the examination paper provided by a new part-time colleague in Insurance and Risk Management.

I also saw evidence of a commitment to quality review. Course Convenors, for example, kept me informed of overall standards

in courses and of any changes which they noted.

The School procedures are first class. I commend xxx and <> team (particularly xxx) in particular for a superbly run process. I was impressed by the quality of internal moderation, the paperwork, the conduct of the exam board and the great care taken to ensure procedural fairness. I was provided with ample information and queries were speedily addressed.

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 ILOs were commensurate with the awards.

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.*

Yes

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 were fairly and imaginatively designed. The combination of essay and examination allows students to showcase their strengths and seemed, in my experience, to support students across the year.

Marking and classification arrangements were fair, carefully applied, and transparent.

Strong student performance suggests high quality teaching, learning, and assessment methods. The strength of the student performance in the Dissertation module, and at first class level generally, is noteworthy.

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.*

Yes – assessments appropriately tested students.

Exam questions were varied and essay questions testing.

The student cohort seemed to be, from exam performance, hardworking, engaged, and achieving high levels of performance.

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.

N/A

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 timeliness of the syllabi I saw and the nature of the examination questions/essays, suggest a close engagement between research and teaching.

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.*

I was provided with all information necessary to be an effective External Examiner.

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 – all appropriate documents were provided.

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- all draft papers were provided and the questions were appropriate.

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 – a good sample of work made available. Informative cover letters were provided, as were the mark profiles for the particular subjects. The scripts also contained useful annotations which were very useful.

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

Yes – subjects tended to be thoughtful and challenging, showing considerably maturity among the student cohort.

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 Board was very well organized. I attended the meeting. I found it to be very well run and I was entirely satisfied as to the recommendations of the Board.

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

Yes .

Other comments

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

I strongly commend the School of Law on a very well-run assessment process and on its commitment to the highest teaching and learning standards.

<>

10 October 2012

Dear <>

I am writing to formally acknowledge receipt of your external examiner's report for the 2011-12 academic year and to thank you for the very kind and supportive comments you made. Your appreciation of the work of the examinations team and named individuals in particular will be passed to them.

It is very pleasing indeed to note your positive comments in relation to the learning and teaching methods at Leeds and to the high quality work many of our students are able to produce. The School has worked hard in recent years to improve the quality of the information on assessments and marking that we provide to students and also the post assessment feedback. Given that students do not have obvious comparisons to make with other institutions it is sometimes difficult to measure the 'success' of these initiatives on student feedback alone. Your positive comments on these issues (allied to those of other external examiners) are very heartening and certainly provide us with the impetus to continue these initiatives.

In addition, we are currently in the process of reviewing our undergraduate programmes and the comments of external examiners such as you as to how things are currently operating are very valuable. Many thanks for your work.

Yours sincerely

<>

Head of School

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:	Law
Subject(s):	Law
Programme(s) / Module(s):	LAW 2270 Land Law LAW3120 Jurisprudence LAW3131 Law and Environment I LAW3135 Law and Environment II LAW3240 Equity and Trusts LAW5370M European Environmental Law LAW 5730M Land Law LAW5760M Equity and Trusts LAW5810M Pollution Control LAW3225 Dissertation LAW3320 Long dissertation
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	LLB; LLM; BA Legal Studies

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

Although I was well briefed by the University on my appointment, I found the amount of assessments I was sent in my first year quite overwhelming. This has diminished in subsequent years but it is still quite daunting. Having said that, I've been perfectly happy with the standard and thoroughness of marking, and the range and coverage of assessments. Initially, I was concerned as to the practice of awarding a minimum mark of 20% but I can now see the rationale behind it. This was the first year I was able to attend the final exam board and I was impressed by the efficient and professional way in which it was conducted. The School of Law's Learning & Teaching Support Coordinator has been very helpful in giving plenty of advance notice as to the timings of assessments and examination boards.

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 aims, ILOs, structure and content of the modules for which I acted as external examiner were all appropriate and the standards commensurate with the level of 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 objectives of the programmes are in line with those of similar programmes with which I am familiar, fulfilling the requirements of the QAAHE Framework for HE Qualifications, the Law subject benchmark statement and the requirements of the JASB.

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.*

A range of assessment methods was used giving students good opportunities for progression and successful completion. Many of them produced work of a very high standard, indicating that they will have been taught well and provided with sufficient information about what was required for their assessments.

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.*

Assessments appeared to be sufficiently representative of the syllabus topics and designed in such a way as to test appropriate levels of learning. Some of the dissertations were particularly impressive, demonstrating a sophisticated grasp of the law and its implications. The academic standard demonstrated by the better students compares favourably with those from other good UK law schools. The students' literacy and subject-based understanding is generally sound.

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.

I was not aware of any specific enhancements to the programmes since last year but this is by no means a criticism. It is clear that the Law School attracts high calibre students who are effectively taught and who perform accordingly.

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.

Most of the assessments I saw - examinations scripts as well as courseworks - showed evidence of wider reading by students, e.g. articles in academic journals. This was apparent even in relation to recent legal developments which formed the subject-matter of, e.g. the Land Law exams.

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.*

I did not need to request any further information.

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 material with which I was provided (including answer outlines to examination questions) was exemplary.

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 was provided with all draft examination papers and coursework questions, all of which were appropriate.

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?

(More than) sufficient work was made available to me. The internal examiners appeared to have applied appropriate standards consistently and fairly. The comments made by internal markers on the examination scripts were useful in helping me to appreciate why a particular mark had been awarded. Most scripts were clearly marked but not all were annotated. All internal markers should be urged to include a line of comment at the end of each answer.

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

The dissertation subjects were appropriate.

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 administration of the assessment process was very efficient. I attended the meeting of the Board of Examiners and was satisfied with the Board's recommendations.

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

Yes.

Other comments

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

<<>>

10 October 2012

Dear <>

I am writing to formally acknowledge receipt of your external examiner's report for the 2011-12 academic year and to thank you for the comments you made. The School of Law values very much both the supportive comments and advice you offer with regard to how our processes may be improved. I would also like to thank you for attending our examinations board at what is a very busy time of the year.

In regard to your previous experience at Leeds we have worked hard to appoint further external examiners to share the burden of external examining more widely (and evenly) and continue to try to ensure this is the case. We have also tried to explain with greater clarity how the 20-90 marking scale at Leeds operates. This can be a rather confusing system at first blush but it is good to know we were able to explain it sufficiently that you could recognise its rationale. It is a system that we are familiar with but it is of course very important that we are able to clearly explain it and justify it.

Thank you also for your comments in relation to how you have found the administrative process attached to external examining at Leeds. We work hard to ensure our examiners are provided with as smooth an administrative experience as possible so that you are able to concentrate your attention to the assessments themselves.

I note that the examination scripts you received were not all annotated. We do try to ensure this so the issue will be followed up by the Director of Student Education. We are currently reviewing our undergraduate programmes and our assessment feedback will be reviewed as part of this process. Your comments about feedback in previous reports as well as in your recent report will certainly form a valuable part of that discussion.

Again, many thanks for your contribution to our assessment processes.

Yours sincerely

<>

Head of School

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:	Law
Subject(s):	
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Cyberlaw, International E-Commerce Law, Patents & Copyright, Trade Marks, Intellectual Property Management, International Governance of IP
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	LLB, LLM

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?

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 learning outcomes and the standard of the assessed material were very satisfactory, reflecting a normal distribution of results.

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 only benchmark I have is the performance of students studying similar subjects at <<>>. My impression is that the students performance is comparable.

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.*

Very satisfactory.

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.*

The students exhibit a normal distribution pattern. Some foreign students do not have adequate language and analytical skills to write dissertations of an adequate quality.

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 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.

The feedback provided to students was very comprehensive.

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.

As previously commented, the courses sometimes appear to reflect too closely the attitudes and perceptions of the academic in question, rather than being a more objective and rounded review of the subject area.

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

Not applicable

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.

Yes

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

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 made suggestions concerning some of the questions, but generally it was satisfactory.

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.

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

Yes.

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?

Yes.

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

It appears so.

Other comments

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

<<>>

29 October 2012

Dear <>

I am writing to formally acknowledge receipt of your external examiner's report for the 2011-12 academic year and to thank you for the comments you made.

We have noted your comments about the language and analytic skills of some international students. The view of the School, and the wider university, is that a dissertation of at least 20 credits should be a core component of an undergraduate degree within a research-intensive institution. We will therefore need to look at how we might support these students through dissertation supervision and referrals to appropriate support services within the wider university rather than encouraging such students to opt out of completing a dissertation. We are currently reviewing our undergraduate curriculum, which provides an opportunity to look closely at the dissertation module.

We have also noted your comments about the tendency for some modules to reflect too closely the attitudes and perceptions of the academic in question, rather than being a more objective and rounded review of the subject area. We will raise this with the relevant module convenors.

Thank you also for your comments in relation to how you have found the administrative process attached to external examining at Leeds. We work hard to ensure our examiners are provided with as smooth an administrative experience as possible so that you are able to concentrate your attention to the assessments themselves.

Again, many thanks for your contribution to our assessment processes.

Yours sincerely

<>

Head of School

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:	Law
Subject(s):	<i>Law</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	English Legal System (LLM and LAW1040), English Law: System, Context & Methods (LAW1045), Policing I (LAW5110M), Policing II (LAW5215M), Policing (LAW3160), Principles of Criminal Law (LAW1140), Evidence (LAW3100), Dissertations.
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	LLB, LLM

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?

Yes.

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.*

I believe the programme aims and ILO's were commensurate for the award. I had the opportunity of looking at both the programme and module awards and I believe that they are appropriate for the awards and also comparable to those in other institutions. I have no concerns about any of the aims and ILOs

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 undergraduate aims and ILOs are certainly in line with the national benchmarks for law. They are also comparable to other institutions that I am aware of. In terms of the LLM programme I can confirm that these are appropriate and were comparable to other LLM provision that I am aware of in comparable 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.*

The assessment methods were good and it was clear that a student undertaking the assessments in the modules that I examined would be able to demonstrate that they met the learning outcomes for each of the modules. I saw drafts of assessments and am happy to confirm that I think they were of the right standard and structure.

From seeing the student performance I have no concerns as to the quality of the teaching, learning & assessment methods which I believe are very high.

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.*

Yes, the students were clearly able to demonstrate their achievement. I paid particular attention to the border grades and also the pass/fail students. It was very clear why the students who failed achieved the marks that they did and that this was linked inextricably to the fact that they had not met the ILOs of a particular module.

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.

N/A (First report)

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.

It is clear that the research undertaken by the Law School has an influence on the content of the modules and the way in which the assessments are designed.

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

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.*

I thought the material that was given to me was excellent and I was fully briefed on how the University of Leeds reaches its decisions, and what its marking processes are. I thought the induction arrangements have been excellent.

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 was fully briefed about all aspects of my role and was given sufficient material and was also confident that should I wish anything else it would be given to me.

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.

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 samples given to me were excellent. I particularly commend the approach of sending all fails and firsts. I paid particular attention to the differences between the grades and was able to do this through the sample provided.

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

Yes. I was extremely impressed with the quality of some of the dissertations and some of the topics that were chosen. Some of the dissertations I saw involved extremely challenging topics but it was clear that the students were prepared for this and had received appropriate academic support throughout the module.

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. The board was conducted in a very professional manner and each member of the board was fully involved with decisions, including where there was any discretion. The external examiners were fully involved in the examination board and were encouraged to intervene where they thought it necessary.

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

Yes but at the same time it was clear that the arrangements took into account proper concerns about confidentiality.

Other comments

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

This was my first examination board at the University of Leeds and I have been very impressed with the way that everything has been handled. I am an experienced external examiner but the conduct of the examination arrangements and the administration surrounding my role has been excellent and probably the best of all universities I have attended.

I particularly commend the Law School for its dedication in using the full range of marks. There was only one module where I had any doubt whether the full-range was being used but in general I was extremely happy with the marks awarded. There are some excellent students at the University of Leeds and it is important that strong performances are reflected in the marks awarded. I am delighted that they were.

I also wish to commend the quality of the feedback that is given to students. I think there is some excellent examples of high-quality feedback that will allow students to understand the mark that they have been given and what they could do to improve performance. I saw examples of feedback that did this not only in respect of the lower end marks but also the upper-end and this is to be strongly commended. It is good to see that a first-class mark just does not receive feedback the equivalent of 'well-done' but also shows how further improvements can be made.

<<>>

2 October 2012

Dear <>

I am writing to formally acknowledge receipt of your external examiner's report for the 2011-12 academic year and to thank you for the comments you made. We are encouraged that we have made a good first impression and hope we can continue to do so over the next two to three years. I would also like to thank you for attending our examinations board at what is a very busy time of the year.

Thank you also for your comments in relation to how you have found the administrative process attached to external examining at Leeds. We work hard to ensure our examiners are provided with as smooth an administrative experience as possible so that you are able to concentrate your attention to the assessments themselves.

Again, many thanks for your contribution to our assessment processes.

Yours sincerely,

<>

Head of School

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:	Law
Subject(s):	<i>Law</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Family Law; Criminal Law
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	LLB

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

. No

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?

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

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 ILOs were appropriate for the modules. The structure and content of the programmes was also appropriate.

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 ILOs were in line with similar programmes at 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.*

The design, structure of assessments methods and arrangements for marking and classification were all entirely appropriate.

I was concerned by the number of fails on the criminal law course and have discussed this with those organising the course. There were also many excellent papers indicating there was no problem with the teaching, although more may need to be to identify and assist weaker 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.*

As just mentioned there were an unusual number of failures on the criminal paper. However, the same course produced many excellent performances.

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

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 was particular impressed by the use of oral examinations in the family paper, a form of assessment instituted by <<>>. This produced a broad range of forms of assessment and worked well.

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.

No comment

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

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.*

I had sufficient access to the material I needed.

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

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. Yes.

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. Yes.

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

Yes. Yes. I was very impressed with the general standard of dissertations.

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?

Yes. I was unable to attend the Board.

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

I cannot comment

Other comments

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

<<>>

2 October 2012

Dear <>

I am writing to formally acknowledge receipt of your external examiner's report for the 2011-12 academic year and to thank you for the comments you have made. The School of Law values very much both the supportive comments and advice you offer with regard to how our processes may be improved.

Thank you also for your comments in relation to how you have found the administrative process attached to external examining at Leeds. We work hard to ensure our examiners are provided with as smooth an administrative experience as possible so that you are able to concentrate your attention to the assessments themselves.

We have noted your comments in relation to Criminal Law. At Leeds, we review our modules each year and reflect upon student performance as part of that process. I will ensure that the module convenor, <>, reviews the support made available to weaker students.

We are currently reviewing our undergraduate programmes and our approach to assessments will be reviewed as part of this process. Your comments about the value of oral assessments will certainly form a valuable part of that discussion.

Again, many thanks for your contribution to our assessment processes.

Yours sincerely

<>

Head of School

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:	Law
Subject(s):	<i>Public Law</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Constitutional law, administrative law, human rights law and related subjects
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	LLB, LLM

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?

No.

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

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.*

I have no concerns in this regard.

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.*

Yes.

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.*

I have been very positively impressed with what I have seen in this regard. Assessment methods and their design and structure seem sound, well conceived, and well executed.

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.*

Yes, absolutely.

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.

n/a: this is my first year

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.

There is good evidence of this, notably (in my area) with regard to terrorism and the law.

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.*

Yes.

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.

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 and yes.

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?

On the whole, yes.
Scripts were clearly marked, yes.

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

Yes.

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 arrangements were more than satisfactory. I was not able to attend the meeting of the Board of Examiners.

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

I cannot judge this.

Other comments

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

I have no further comments.

<<>>

26 October 2012

Dear <>

I am writing to formally acknowledge receipt of your external examiner's report for the 2011-12 academic year and to thank you for the comments you made. We are encouraged that we have made a good first impression and hope we can continue to do so over the next three years. We are currently reviewing our undergraduate curriculum and have noted in particular your comments about the integration of research and teaching/learning.

Thank you also for your comments in relation to how you have found the administrative process attached to external examining at Leeds. We work hard to ensure our examiners are provided with as smooth an administrative experience as possible so that you are able to concentrate your attention to the assessments themselves.

Again, many thanks for your contribution to our assessment processes.

Yours sincerely,

<>

Head of School