

# 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:

BUSINESS SCHOOL

Subject(s):

Programme(s) / Module(s):

• MSc Actuarial Finance      • MSc Financial Risk Management  
• MSc Finance & Investment

Awards (e.g. BAVSc/MSc etc):

MSc

##### 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?

Yes, I was given a copy of the relevant documents.

##### 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.

Learning outcomes & structure of programmes are appropriate.  
Standards are suitable for the MSc courses

**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.

generally comparable to similar programmes that being delivered at

**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.

Overall, consistent methods were used in assessments. Perhaps formative assessment could be introduced to enhance student learning/feedback

**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, assessments were carefully designed to enable students to show their understanding and knowledge of the module materials.

**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.*

Curriculum design incorporates current issues & developments e.g. the global financial crisis. Students were encouraged to make references to real-life examples.

**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

My mentor has been v. helpful & supportive to me in this, my first, year of being external examiner.

**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, guidance was given to me to act effectively as EE.

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, draft exam & assignments were sent to me for review/comments. It would however be useful if draft papers can be sent to me together.

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?

Sample scripts were given to EE, along with detailed module statistics & markers comments were also included in most cases.

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?

Overall very impressed with the support received but I would recommend not to reading out all those marks that fall into "discretionary" bands @ the board.

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

Yes, I understand that a sub-committee is set up to look at carefully the merit & evidence of each individual cases before the Board.

**Other comments**

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

✓

<<>>

18 May 2015

Dear ,

Thank you for your recent Examiner's Report for the MSc in Finance and Investment and MSc Financial Risk Management.

We are very pleased with your comments on our programme, especially those around the overall course design, which you describe as interesting, challenging and high quality. The programme team have worked hard to design an attractive programme for their students, and your comments provide a rewarding acknowledgement of this.

We are happy to hear that you feel that our assessment methods are generally appropriate. The feedback that you have provided has helped the team to make improvements to the student experience, and it is always gratifying to have our teaching methods reviewed and found to be of a standard that allows our students to make good progress. Your particular comment on the prospect of introducing more formative assessment in the programme is much appreciated and will be examined by the A&F Division. Also, I'd like to assure you that your comments on the exam board procedures (especially with respect to reading out all marks in the discretionary band) have been passed to PGEB Chair for consideration. We will continue to monitor and review our assessment methods in line with your feedback and suggestions.

The praise that you have given to our staff is very rewarding and we are very grateful for your supportive comments and your continued guidance for our programmes.

Yours sincerely,

<<>>

**Dean**  
**Leeds University Business School**

<<>>