

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