

**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>	LUBS2125 Anthropology for Business LUBS2130 Contemporary Business Issues LUBS2775 Research Methods LUBS2780 Information in Organisations LUBS3003 Business Ethics LUBS3050 Info Mgmt in Organisations
<i>Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):</i>	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](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*

.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?*

Yes

**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*

NA

## 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 and programmes contents reviewed are appropriate. Standards are appropriate for the different elements of 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.*

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.*

I believe a lot of effort enhanced by expertise was put in the modules reviewed. I was very satisfied overall with the marking and its quantitative distribution.

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.*

The submissions reviewed reflected very good standards of delivery. Comparative Students performance was excellent.

5. **For Examiners responsible for programmes that include clinical practice components, please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum**

NA

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.*

NA

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.*

Most of what reviewed was linked to current affairs and relevant academic research.

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

NA

## 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

NA

## 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

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

NA

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?

Yes where appropriate.

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

NA

## Other comments

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

<>

Dear <>

Thank you for your External Examiner's Report for the Academic year 2013-2014 covering modules on our masters programmes.

We are very pleased that you believe our modules are generally in good shape, the standards of assessment are appropriate, the student performance is satisfactory and the quality of our research-led teaching meets the intended learning outcomes. I can confirm that LUBS5730M Entrepreneurship & Innovation is being replaced with a module with more appropriate assessment targets. We are also introducing a marking guide that will be used by all MBA dissertation supervisors/markers in the future which will address unsigned second marking and difficult to follow hand written feedback. Further workshops have been added to the teaching schedule to advise students on choice of topic. We are also pleased that you had a positive experience as an external examiner to our programme; however we are aware that there were issues regarding the Examination Board meeting facilitation which will be addressed for 2015

At the Leeds University Business School, we continuously strive to improve the quality of our programmes and always aspire to deliver world-class higher education, within an excellent learning environment. Your contribution, your active support and your most encouraging feedback are of the utmost importance and highly appreciated.

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***Faculty / School of:*

Leeds Business School

*Subject(s):*

LUBS 5222	E-business
LUBS 5225	Strategic Management
LUBS 5229	Management in Practice
LUBS 5227	Strategic Management
LUBS 5712	Management of Projects
LUBS 5735	Strategic Management
LUBS 5762	Man Consultancy
LUBS 5873	Strategic Management
LUBS 5881	MBA Project (Strategic Management)
LUBS 5887	Knowledge Management

*Programme(s) / Module(s):**Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):***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*

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

Standards of marking and achievement remain high. One module, about which I had some concerns last year, is no longer running.

**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.

They are.

**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.

All assessment is well design and appropriate.

**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 cohorts assessed showed a good distribution of marks. No modules stood out in this respect.

**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 removal of the Consulting module has been a positive step.

**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.

Not able to comment.

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

Not able to comment

**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.*

No issues about access to material.

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. Questions were appropriate. I suggested some minor amendments in a few instances.

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. Scripts were clearly annotated.

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

N/A

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 not able to attend the meeting.

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

Can't comment

#### Other comments

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

No comments. Thanks as usual to the admin staff for making this a smooth and easy process.

<<>>  
<<>>

04 March 2015

Dear <<>>

Thank you for your recent Examiner's Report for the MSc Management and your comments.

It is very pleasing to read your positive report regarding the standards of our assessments and student performance in the various areas of the programme.

We are very grateful for your continued contribution to the developments and improvements in the programme, which is much appreciated.

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**

Faculty / School of:	Leeds University Business School																		
Subject(s):	<i>Marketing</i>																		
Programme(s) / Module(s):	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;">LUBS 5210</td> <td>Marketing for Management</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LUBS 5250</td> <td>Project (Management) MSc Management</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LUBS 5495</td> <td>Dissertation</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>LUBS 5748</td> <td>Marketing Management</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LUBS 5775</td> <td>Sales Management</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LUBS 5776</td> <td>Global Marketing &amp; Export Management</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LUBS 5799</td> <td>MBA Project (Marketing)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LUBS 5851</td> <td>Marketing</td> </tr> </table>	LUBS 5210	Marketing for Management	LUBS 5250	Project (Management) MSc Management	LUBS 5495	Dissertation			LUBS 5748	Marketing Management	LUBS 5775	Sales Management	LUBS 5776	Global Marketing & Export Management	LUBS 5799	MBA Project (Marketing)	LUBS 5851	Marketing
LUBS 5210	Marketing for Management																		
LUBS 5250	Project (Management) MSc Management																		
LUBS 5495	Dissertation																		
LUBS 5748	Marketing Management																		
LUBS 5775	Sales Management																		
LUBS 5776	Global Marketing & Export Management																		
LUBS 5799	MBA Project (Marketing)																		
LUBS 5851	Marketing																		
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MSc International Marketing Management, MA Advertising and Marketing, MSc Management, MBA and Executive MBA.																		

**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*

. There are no issues of serious attention before these modules are offered again

**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 – no issues were to be addressed

**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 intended learning outcomes are considered appropriate with the award level
  
- 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 aims and ILOs compare well with other UKHE Institutions with which I am familiar. I am satisfied that they meet FHEQ benchmarks
  
- 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.*

Generally speaking the nature of the assessments and the quality and consistency of the marking was of a good standard, with assessments offering the opportunity for application of theory. Academic staff generally tended to provide a good level of feedback for students, although the use of grids to provide feedback should not be a substitute for qualitative commentary

One module, LUBS 5755 Sales Management, was felt to need clearer direction for the students in terms of expectations from the assessment, and did not appear to include sufficient emphasis on sales management rather than broader management strategy. There was a tendency to over-mark (i.e. to be too generous), particularly at the bottom end of the sample provided. It looks like the module delivery and assessment could benefit from review.

Student performance across the modules generally is of a high standard
  
- 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.*

The modules and assessments provide the opportunity to demonstrate achievement of Aims and ILOs and performance was favourable to other cohorts at other Business Schools.
  
- 5. For Examiners responsible for programmes that include clinical practice components, please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum**

Not applicable
  
- 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.*

Nothing specifically noted
  
- 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.*

Most module assessments were quite practical in nature and therefore were less orientated towards research, however the dissertations and projects were of a high quality, evidencing a variety of methodologies, and the best examples showing a good degree of criticality around the literature.
  
- 8. Where the programme forms part of an Integrated PhD, please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD**

No

#### 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

Not applicable, I am new into external role at Leeds

#### 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.*

The guidance material has been very clear, and the academic and administrative support in undertaking my role, excellent.

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 received all appropriate background material, enabling me to undertake my external assessment with confidence

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 was supplied with all draft assessments and papers, and where comments were made, they were responded to promptly and positively. The nature of the assessments was appropriate

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 happy with the volume of samples in order to establish confidence in the quality and consistency of assessments, and the performance of the cohort overall

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

The choice of dissertation subjects was varied, as might be expected for the marketing subject area, but all were appropriate and adding value. The methods and standard of assessment was consistent and 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?

The administrative arrangements were satisfactory throughout. It was noted during the exam board that the school needed to improve their projection facilities/software such that the screen was legible to external examiner and other board members. This is important to ensure full engagement and input at the board. Moving from paper is fine – but the electronic delivery of the board needs to work well. The board however ran smoothly, and I had confidence in proceedings and the data being presented

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

Yes

#### Other comments

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

18 May 15

Dear <<>>,

Thank you for the report you sent in relation to MSc Management modules.

It is very pleasing to read your very positive and supporting report regarding the standards of our assessments and student performance in the various areas of the programme. Among other modules you have examined, thank you examining the dissertations provided and we were particularly pleased with the comment you made on the quality of dissertations

Along with the positive comments you have made about the programme, we welcome your comments made in relation to your experience at the Boards in relation to projection facilities. We will investigate how we could address these issues in line with your comments. We will always take your constructive suggestions into account and note your comments on the Sales Management module. Having reviewed the content of this module we concur that it did not place sufficient emphasis on specific sales orientated issues, compared to strategic ones. This module has been withdrawn from the full time MBA module catalogue this year and its position in the syllabus will be reviewed.

As this was your first year as our external examiner, I would like to take the opportunity to thank you for your contribution to the continued development and improvement of the programme.

Thank you.

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**

Faculty / School of:	Leeds University Business School
Subject(s):	<i>Management</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/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*

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?*

**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.*

Based on the modules I saw, fully commensurate. ILOs were appropriate and standard of passing work was appropriate for Masters level.

**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.*

Methods of assessment varied, with some based on examination and some on in-course assessment. Some of the in-course assessment required students to demonstrate knowledge and ability to apply both theoretical and practical knowledge to business issues that could be encountered in companies. Where exams were used they examined a range of ILOs.

**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.*

The student work I saw was comparable to other universities where I have taught/been external examiner, and many students attain at a higher level than in some modules I have seen at other universities (this is reflected in higher passing grades). I have also observed work that is not of a passing level being awarded failing grades: there is no evidence that standards are not appropriate.

For an international cohort the level of English is generally good, and students are able to express themselves well in English. I was not aware of evidence of systemic weaknesses.

**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.*

None observed (I examined no courses last year).

**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 is evidence in some material of teaching staff bringing their research into the curriculum. There may be more examples than I am aware of because I am not familiar with the research interests of all faculty teaching on the programme at Leeds, and areas of research are not clearly flagged in syllabuses (nor would I expect them to be – this would lead to even more lengthy documents!).

**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.*

The material was sufficient.

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?

Questions were appropriate, and where I made suggestions the suggestions were adopted or appropriate comments were made to say why this was not done. Occasionally the questions might have benefited from an internal grammar check (with the best will in the world, none of us are perfect at editing our own work, and tend to see what we intended to write rather than what we did write).

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. All scripts were clearly graded, with evidence of second marking

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

Yes. The dissertations were graded appropriately and the range of topics was varied but fitted well with the degree intentions of the students.

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?

The administrative arrangements were excellent. My only criticism was that in the Board of Examiners the spreadsheet was projected and was impossible to see from where I was sitting (I was not alone in this, so it was not simply a matter of moving seats). This led to little discussion, particularly where discretion was exercised as it was not possible to see the student profiles and feel part of the process. We are assured that this will change for next year.

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

Yes.

## Other comments

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

It would be helpful, and has been regarded as good practice at other universities where I have worked or been an external examiner, if module coordinators could provide a brief summary of the module marking, any issues identified and, in particular, some indication of the purpose of the sample of work provided (eg representative sample or anything that would benefit from particular close scrutiny).

Last year my first year as an external examiner was not a happy experience. This year has been completely different: I have been extremely well looked after by the admin team and I have no complaints. In fact, the interaction has been exemplary.



<>

Dear <>,

Thank you for your recent Examiner's Report for the Management Division postgraduate programmes and your comments.

It is very pleasing to read your positive report regarding the standards of our assessments, internal moderation processes and student performance in the various areas of the programme. We are also pleased to hear that you felt the standard of communication with our professional and academic faculty was to your satisfaction this year and that you also had a good overall experience as external examiner.

Along with the positive comments you have made about the programme, we welcome your comments made in relation to your experience at the Boards in relation to projection facilities. This will be addressed for 2015. In addition, we thank you for your suggestions regarding checking internal grammar in assessments / feedback. We will address these issues in line with your comments.

We are very grateful for your continued contribution to the developments and improvements to the programme, which is much appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

<>

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

<>