

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR: 2012– 2013

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

Faculty / School of:	Arts
Subject(s):	<i>History</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Race and Resistance
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MA

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 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

These were entirely positive. I was pleased and impressed by the way in which matters that I had brought up in previous reports or other less formal communications were answered or dealt with. The modules that were brought on line as options for this degree during my term as External (either as replacements for those not running or as additions) were entirely fitting and clearly of interest to those being taught.

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.*

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.*

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 sense continues to be that this is a degree programme that has been very well designed and structured in all forms, and my comments here should be read within that context. This year, I understood from a number of the second markers' comments on the dissertations this year that these had been second marked rather than double-blind marked (i.e. the second marker was, it appeared, able to read the first supervisor's comments and mark before coming to his / her own conclusions). I wonder whether there would be greater disparity between first and second markers if that were not the case?

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 spread in format of assessments was particularly pleasing in that regard. I have commented upon this previously, but I think that the reaction piece to the visit to a relevant museum / exhibition is particularly good.

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.

The concept of including module-by-module improvements on the individual module handbooks is innovative and useful, and ensures continuous enhancement where necessary.

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 all of the modules here draw upon material that originates in the research interests of the relevant member of academic staff. As I have mentioned previously, this MA programme as a whole strikes me as the perfect example of a programme that has developed from the grass roots up as a result of mutual staff teaching and research interests, and is all the better for it.

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?

N/A.

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: I was particularly impressed by the cover sheets for the dissertations, which noted the extent to which supervisors had been contacted and projects discussed. As well as allowing examiners to see this process in action, those elements should also cause students to reflect upon its significance themselves.

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, although I was unable to attend the meeting this year because it took place in term time. Even with some advance notice given, it proved impossible to clear the day in question of previously agreed meetings. Might it be possible to use e.g. skype in future?

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

As far as I am aware.

Other comments

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

I have none, other to say that I have found my term as external for this MA programme rewarding, and would wish to commend all of those associated with it.