

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):	LUBS0070	Introductory Management
	LUBS1085	Exploring your Potential
	LUBS1170	Introduction to Management 1
	LUBS1790	Global Business Challenges
	LUBS1890	Starting Your Own Business
	LUBS2020	From Study to Work
	LUBS2150	People in Organisations
	LUBS2660	Principles: Corporate Strategy
	LUBS3004	Entrepreneurship & Innovation
	LUBS3070	Strategic Management
	LUBS3080	Business Strategy
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	Management	

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?

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 have had a very positive experience at LUBS - the administrative team have been very efficient and supportive and the academic teams thorough and professional. I have rarely found cause to offer critical comment but where I have the teams were always willing to discuss issues and take feedback on board. Although some assessments remain traditional, others have been more innovative in approach as the years have gone by. Academic standards remain high. In terms of process, last year there were issues of comparability between boards, but as I could not attend this year I don't know whether they had been resolved.

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.*

Aims, Intended Learning Outcomes, and the structure and content of the programmes are appropriate to the modules and commensurate to 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.*

I am confident that the aims and intended Learning Outcomes meet all expectations and are comparable with other 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.*

Assessment methods vary from module to module. Assessment instruments are appropriate.

Standards of marking guidance vary and a little more detail would help particularly where there are more than one member of staff in the marking team. There are good processes in place for moderation, and care is taken to ensure consistency of standards for 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.*

Student performance, on the whole, is good, which is a credit to the teaching teams.

Students show good conceptual understanding of the subject areas. T

here is a broad spread of marks which gives me confidence in the structure of the teaching and assessment in allowing for sufficient differentiation.

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.

These are mature modules and as marks are reasonably strong they would appear to be developing appropriately. Perhaps more variety in modes of assessment could be considered.

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 currency of the content of the modules isn't in question from a theoretical viewpoint, which suggests that staff are maintaining appropriate professional standards

There are examples of group work which engage students in conducting research in a practical sense.

Perhaps LUBS could consider how to engage level 6 students in collaborative research with staff as part of their assessment?

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

N/A

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.

All information required is provided; the staff at LUBS have always been helpful and supportive if I have any queries.

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, the supporting information is always provided. Administrative support is always effective and efficient.

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?

Drafts were provided, I had very few comments to make and these were not substantial in nature. I am confident that these are passed on to the appropriate staff and taken into consideration.

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. The deadlines were tight but that's of my own doing as I was unable to come over to LUBS on the day.

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

I did not examine any dissertations

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?

Administrative support has always been efficient. I could not attend the Board this year., so cannot comment on the operation of the Board on the day or the appropriateness of the recommendations, though past experience gives me no reason to doubt that everything would be conducted appropriately.

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

The potential for inconsistency became apparent last year but as I did not attend this year I can't comment on whether those issues had been addressed.

Other comments

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

<>

1st September 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 *Management* programmes.

I am pleased to note that you have had a positive experience at LUBS and are confident of the quality of our modules. I very much appreciate this feedback and thank you for the work done on the papers sent through.

With regard to your comment on whether the potential for inconsistencies at boards had been addressed, I hope to reassure you by explaining that since last year we have tightened up the processes around pre-board and we are happy that this provides a forum for initial consideration of cases by members who represent the various subject boards.

We are constantly seeking to increase the variety of assessment and as you noted some new modules have variable modes of assessment. In mature modules we are encouraging staff to develop changes to assessment where possible and appropriate, but these naturally take a little longer as many traditional assessments are well established with the tutor and module and the impetus for change is not as strong. I do assure you that we are in constant review on all modules, though.

I note your comments about consistency of marking guidelines. We are currently looking at adopting a standard marking matrix across the division (probably part generic part adaptable for the module) and discussing various options with staff. Once finalised this should improve this issue.

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, over the past four years.

Yours sincerely

<>

Dean, Leeds University Business School