

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2013– 2014

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

Faculty / School of:	Law
Subject(s):	Law
Programme(s) / Module(s):	LAW2416; LAW1140; LAW1040; LAW2142; LAW3160; Dissertations (Forgot the Code) and LAW5300M.
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	LLB

Name and home Institution / affiliation of Examiner**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 Quality Assurance**
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 ILOs remain consistent and fair. They are appropriate for the programme(s) set and allow students to undertake their work fairly and with the opportunity to gain high marks where 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 programmes were comparable to other equivalent institutions and meet the standards of the benchmark.

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 were all set in an appropriate manner and allowed the students to demonstrate their ability. The performance suggests there are no problems in the learning & teaching strategy.

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 cohort, like at most institutions, was divided with "clear blue water" between the best and worst students. This is something that exists at other institutions, including my own.

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.

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 research influences many of the programmes and this is certainly reflected in the assessments.

8. **Where the programme forms part of an Integrated PhD, please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD**

n/a

For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements

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

I was asked to act as a mentor but despite asking my mentee if they wanted assistance I have heard nothing. Unfortunately I wasn't able to attend the board this year which probably didn't help.

The Examination/Assessment Process

10. 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

11. 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

12. 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

13. 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 – indeed it could be argued that Leed's policy of sending all fails and firsts means that almost too much work is sent.

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

Yes. As usual, there was some truly excellent work.

15. 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?

Unfortunately I could not attend the board this year.

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

I saw no reason to doubt this.

Other comments

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

School of Law

The Liberty Building
University of Leeds
Leeds LS2 9JT



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

1 September 2014

Dear

Thank you for your report. We are pleased to hear that you have retained confidence in our learning and teaching strategy.

We have noted your comments about our policy of sending all firsts and fails. Whilst we would like to continue to send all the latter, following feedback from our external examiners we intended to send only a sample of first class work from 14/15 onwards, unless the number of firsts is small.

Your feedback on the mentoring scheme is useful as we have had a mixed response from mentors and mentees. We will discuss with the University of Leeds Quality Assurance Team at a scheduled meeting next month.

Finally, we were sorry that you are unable to attend the board this year and look forward to another opportunity to thank you for your continued support.

Yours sincerely,