

**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:

Leeds University Business School

Subject(s):

Programme(s) / Module(s):

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| LUBS0060 | Introduction to HRM                      |
| LUBS1080 | Personal Tutorials for HRM               |
| LUBS1125 | Economic Institutions (Labour)           |
| LUBS1585 | Economic Institutions (Ind)              |
| LUBS1755 | Business & Society (Combined)            |
| LUBS1760 | Business & Society Organisational Theory |
| LUBS1765 | Business & Society Social Theory         |
| LUBS1850 | Organisational Behaviour                 |
| LUBS2000 | Management Work & Organisation           |
| LUBS2060 | Contemporary Ind. Relations              |
| LUBS2885 | HRM Research Practice & PT               |
| LUBS2890 | Organisation & Human Resource            |
| LUBS3001 | Gender & Equality at Work                |
| LUBS3002 | Diversity Management                     |
| LUBS3055 | Controversies                            |
| LUBS3095 | Global Perspectives on HRM               |
| LUBS3310 | HR Mgmt: Dissertation                    |
| LUBS3855 | Strategic Human Resource Mgmt            |

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

BA HRM

**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](mailto: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*

The peer assessment element of LUBS2060 needs to be refocused. Peer assessment can be a valuable tool to enhance student learning, but at the moment the marking guidelines given to students do not adequately reflect the module learning outcomes, with the result that students are not using peer assessment as an opportunity to develop an enhanced understanding of how to learn while also over-marking.

**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 for the level of the award. Assessments and marking standards were appropriate and in line with practice at other leading universities.

### 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, aims and ILOs are in line with HEFCE subject benchmark statements for business and management. Programme content is broadly in line comparable programmes offered by other leading universities. In some important respects (particularly the teaching of research methods and the accompanying demanding standards of critical thinking and analytical skills) the programme is in advance of other comparable programmes.

### 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.*

Assessments were well designed to examine the module and programme learning outcomes. It was pleasing to see a mix of assessment methods and high quality feedback on all modules. There was clear evidence of careful and rigorous procedures in the setting and marking of work. There was remarkable consistency in marking standards between modules and markers. Procedures for classifying awards were also clear, appropriate and carefully implemented.

Some of the student work, particularly in year three, was very good indeed, and a pleasure to read. This indicated to me that the quality of teaching, learning and assessment on the programme is 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, students were given adequate opportunities to demonstrate achievement. The mix of exams and course work facilitated this. At the top end, I thought student performance was as good if not better than I have seen at other leading universities. This was particularly the case for research methods and dissertation modules. Performance on the third year modules LUBS3855 and LUBS3002 was also very good indeed. Overall, this was a strong cohort of students, although there were some weaker students, who did not appear to have engaged with the programme, at the bottom end.

### 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.*

A number of modifications and improvements have been made to the assessments on research methods and dissertation preparation modules. Students on these modules (LUBS2885 HRM Research Practice & PT, LUBS3055 Controversies & LUBS3310 HR Mgmt: Dissertation) produced some very high quality work which demonstrated advanced critical thinking and analytical skills.

### 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 informing teaching and curriculum design across all modules. Research methods and dissertation modules encouraged students to undertake their own research, and where students did this, results were impressive. Students were taught how to critique the academic literature and to critically evaluate research methods with reference to research undertaken by Leeds faculty.

### 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

No specific issues to comment on.

#### 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.*

I had sufficient access to all the information I needed. I was sent hard copies of the relevant rules, regulations and guidance in good time, and I also had access to this material via the intranet.

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. Full information was sent out with draft assessments and exam scripts/essays. Additional module and programme information was made available to me via the intranet (giving me access to the intranet was a welcome innovation compared to previous years).

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. I had a few minor comments on the drafts, but this mainly related to the clarity and wording of questions, not the nature, level and appropriateness, all of which were unproblematic.

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. I was given a broad range of scripts in sufficient quantities to get a clear picture of marking practice and standards. If anything I was perhaps given more scripts than I could reasonably be expected to look at given the remuneration for the post. Scripts were marked to provide evidence of who the marker and moderator was and most had notes to explain and justify grades.

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

Yes. Last year I recommended that marking for dissertations move to double blind marking, to ensure that any tendencies for dissertation supervisors to over-mark their supervisees work was countered. I was pleased to see that this suggestion had been implemented.

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?

I attended the exam board. Administrative arrangements were very good. Draft assessments and scripts were sent out in plenty of time with very good supporting paperwork. The Board of Examiners worked well and I was satisfied with the recommendations. I was pleased to see that comments made in previous years about the way in which mitigating circumstances were handled had been acted on.

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

Yes, processes for dealing with mitigating circumstances worked much better than was the case in the previous two years I have undertaken this role. I was pleased to see evidence of careful consideration of mitigating circumstances in the pre-exam board meeting, with the result that there was fairness and consistency in the treatment of students with mitigating circumstances in the main board meetings.

#### Other comments

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

N/A

11<sup>th</sup> August 2014

<>

***Reference: External Examination Report 2013-14***

Dear <>,

Thank you for your report as external examiner for the academic year 2013-14 in respect of the Human Resource Management and Management programmes.

I am pleased to note that you gave positive comments on our programme, our modules, their delivery methods and assessment design. It was also a pleasure to hear your comments at the examination board about the quality of our students' work, particularly in the final year dissertation module.

Thank you for your helpful comments on the assessment for LUBS2060. For this coming semester we are re-thinking the marking guidelines and criteria for the peer assessment aspect of the module to bring it in line with broader faculty practice while refining to specifically address the learning outcomes of the module.

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

Yours sincerely

<>

Dean, Leeds University Business School

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**  
**ACADEMIC YEAR: 2013– 2014**

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

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <i>Faculty / School of:</i>          | Leeds University Business School  |
| <i>Subject(s):</i>                   |   |
| <i>Programme(s) / Module(s):</i>     | LUBS2810      Business & the Legal Environ.<br>LUBS3915      Employment Law |
| <i>Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):</i> | HRM   |

**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](mailto: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*

**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 aims and learning outcome are entirely commensurate with the level of the award

2. **Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?**
- *The comparability of the programme(s) with similar programme(s) at other institutions and against national benchmarks and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications.*

They did

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.*

It is clear that students are well taught and have access to a wide range of authoritative sources and can deal with complex legal issues. The assessment methods reflect the detail of the module and allow student a very good opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge, understanding and application of legal materials.

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 in 2012/13, the student body as a whole demonstrated their capabilities well and achieved a very good academic standard.

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.*

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 curriculum draws on the developing body of research on legal issues very effectively.

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



## 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

## 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.*

I feel very well supported, though published materials, on line materials and interaction with teaching staff.

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, I did

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?

I was and was very happy that questions were appropriately posed and related to material which was appropriate and consistent with the teaching content and curriculum.

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

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

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?

I was well supported by the administrative staff but cannot comment on the Board itself as I was unable to attend this year.

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

I was unable to attend the Board this year but, if it followed the same procedures as it did in 2013 when I was present, then I am confident that appropriate procedures are in place for these issues to be properly addressed.

## Other comments

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

<>

27<sup>th</sup> August 2014

***Reference: External Examination Report 2013-14***

Dear <>,

Thank you for your report as external examiner for the academic year 2013-14 in respect of the *Human Resource Management* programmes.

I am pleased to note that you were happy with the level of the learning outcomes, assessments and examples of student work you reviewed.

It is also good to hear that you felt supported throughout the process, and had no negative comments to make about the standard of work our processes of external examining.

On behalf of the Business School may I again thank you for your suggestions and for your comments on our modules, our programmes, and our examining. We greatly appreciate the assistance you have given to us, and I look forward to meeting you at next year's examination board, if you are able to come to Leeds.

Yours sincerely

<>

Dean, Leeds University Business School