

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**  
ACADEMIC YEAR: 2014– 2015

**Part A: General Information****Subject area and awards being examined**Faculty / School  
of:

Law

Subject(s):

Law

Programme(s) /  
Module(s):

Code	Module	Credits
LAW5585M	International Trade Finance	15
LAW5590M	International Sales Law	15
LAW5645M	International Law of Foreign Investment	15
LAW5655M	World Trade Organisation	15
LAW5780M	Dissertation: International Trade Law	60
LAW5830M	International Economic Law	15

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

LLM

**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.*

The aims and ILOs were appropriate for a Masters level programme in Law.
  
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.*

The assessment methods for the LLM programme are similar to methods followed by other institutions. A combination of essays and a dissertation gives the students ample opportunity to engage in research and exhibit their analytical skills, thus preparing them for doctoral studies.
  
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 students were given ample opportunity to demonstrate their analytical skills. As with any student cohort there are going to be some brilliant students and some verging on the average. This is not dissimilar to student cohorts in institutions where I have acted as external.
  
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.*

Nothing to comment apart from saying that the programme is well thought out and the range of available options impressive.
  
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.*

Law is a fast moving subject, especially in the case of modules that I examined. It is apparent from the scripts I received that the students have benefitted from the research interests of staff who have taught the modules.
  
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.*

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?**

I was provided an opportunity to comment on the draft examination papers.

- 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 to both parts of the question.

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

Yes.

- 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 matters relating to dispatch of scripts were exemplary. Unfortunately, I could not attend the board meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> November due to commitments at my institution.

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

Unable to comment.

#### Other comments

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

None.

<<>>

15 December 2016

Dear <<>>

Many thanks for the work you have carried out in 2014-15 as an external examiner at Leeds. Your confirmation about the operation and outcomes of the modules you reviewed is very reassuring and pleasing. I hope we have been able to make the process of external examining a smooth and efficient one but do please let us know if there are further things we can do.

There will be some changes to operations for 2015-16 which have resulted from our ongoing dialogue with our external examiners and internal initiatives. Firstly, we will be seeking to introduce student anonymity to our next round of examination boards. This is largely a question of changing some of the administration but certainly should be possible. Secondly, the use of categorical marking is also being piloted in two level one undergraduate modules. This development stems from a desire to have more certainty in the justification of individual marks. In the June 2015 undergraduate board there was some discussion about the difficulties of explaining the difference between single percentages (e.g. differentiating a 64 from a 65) and a move to a banded system might reduce that uncertainty. If this proposal develops further we will, of course, keep our external examiners fully informed.

I hope we have not placed undue pressure on you this academic year. I realise that the turn-around times have been very tight and we will constantly work to ease the burden wherever we can. Again, many thanks and I look forward to working with you during the next year.

Yours sincerely

<<>>

Head of School