

**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):	<i>Law</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Foundations of Law, Employment Law
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	LLB

**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?*

NA

**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 programme aims and learning outcomes are appropriate for the award being considered. The new module Foundations of Law was very well devised, and worked very well.  
The learning outcomes are clear and the structure and content of the course are sound.

**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 are appropriate for the national subject benchmarks. The programmes are comparable with similar programmes at other HE 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.*

The design and structure of the assessments are good and clear. Fair arrangements are made for marking. There was clear evidence of moderation. The arrangements for award classification seemed clear and fair. The student performance at the top end was very good and an indication of good teaching.  
The structure of assessment for the new Foundations of Law module are imaginative, and provide a very fair method of assessment.

**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 academic standards demonstrated by students were at times very high.  
Students are given appropriate opportunities to demonstrate their achievement of the ILOs.

**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.*

The range of understanding of jurisprudence and legal system demonstrated in the Foundations of Law module was excellent. If feel that this module is an excellent model for an introductory first year module in Law, which other institutions could learn from.

**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 research interests of staff are reflected in the content of the course taught, suggesting that the teaching is research informed.

**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.*

Yes, good access to materials, including access to online materials.

- 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?**

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?**

Yes. I was unable to attend the board, so cannot comment on this aspect.

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

Not present at exam board.

## Other comments

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

School of Law

The Liberty Building  
University of Leeds  
Leeds LS2 9JT

T  
F



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

9 October 2015

Dear

I am writing to thank you for your commitment to our external examining process through 2014-15. I appreciate that external examining is perhaps not the most thrilling task undertaken as part of an academic's job but your close attention to the task is most useful to us.

This was the first time the newly developed Foundations of Law module had run and it is very pleasing to note your positive feedback. The module is seen as essential in preparing the students for the rest of their degree and has been well conceived. The feedback from students is positive so your additional, objective comments are valuable.

I hope that the administrative burden was not too great and we will aim to make the task as convenient as possible in future. However, if there are changes that we can make please do let us know.

Again, many thanks for your help and support.

Yours sincerely

Head of School

# 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):	LAW3031, LAW3032, LAW3033, LAW3320, LAW3340, LAW3341, LAW3342, LAW5334, LAW5338, LAW5686M, LAW5687M, LAW5688M, LAW692M, LAW5694M, LAW5697M, LAW5698M, LAW5780M.
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	LLB, 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*

Not Applicable

#### 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?*

Not Applicable

#### 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*

Not Applicable

## 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.*

I think the programme Aims and ILOs are entirely appropriate for the level of the award at both LLB and LLM levels.

**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.*

Assessment by essay is appropriate for the units in question, and the marking and classification are in line with comparator institutions. Performance at the top end is clearly influenced by the quality of the teaching.

**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 is consistent, and demonstrates the range of abilities one would expect to find at both LLB and LLM levels.

**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.*

Teaching and assessment maintain the high standard of previous years.

**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 nature of the work undertaken by the students indicates a solid engagement with current research in the areas of cyberlaw and intellectual property.

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

Not applicable

## 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

## 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 and 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, I made some suggestions for minor amendments – these were duly taken on board.

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. Feedback to students was detailed and thoughtful (and helpful for externalling)

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

Yes and 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?

Yes, No, N/A.

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

Did not attend exam board (on sabbatical).

## Other comments

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

Not applicable

<<>>

14 December 2015

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 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.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that the central university is currently reviewing the 20-90 marking scale that we operate. I will keep you fully informed should any changes result.

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



# 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:	School of Law
Subject(s):	<i>LLB</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	LAW2142, LAW5810; LAW2146; LAW2143; LAW3320; LAW3100; LAW1141; LAW5300M; LAW3135;
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	LL.B; LL.M.

#### 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*

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*

#### 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 were appropriate for the degrees that I examined. They meet the relevant subject benchmark and allow the students to fully demonstrate their knowledge and application.

**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. Law has a draft Framework under discussion but the modules would meet both the existing and new framework.

**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 design and structure is fine. They allow the students to demonstrate their abilities and it is clear that the staff look at the ILOs when deciding their marks. I am fully satisfied that the markers took their role seriously.

**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 very strongest students were producing some excellent work, particularly in the dissertations and international law modules. The work is comparable to institutions that I am aware of.

**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.*

None that I am aware of.

**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 that staff do involve research in the design of the curriculum, as would be expected of a research-led institution. This is particularly evident in the modules relating to international law, environmental law and the LL.M. 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**

I was approached to be a mentor to a new external examiner but I was never contacted by that examiner. To an extent that is not necessarily surprising but I do wonder whether the mentoring scheme works.

**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. I am particularly pleased to see that a decision has been taken that all firsts and fails no longer need to be sent. Fails that are at the real bottom end are unlikely to be salvageable by the external examiner (especially given the new rules on our powers). Similarly, it is appropriate that a sample of 1<sup>st</sup> class work is sent to me – particularly borderlines – to check that the grade is being used correctly rather than look at each script.

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

Yes. I saw no problem and the dissertations I saw included very strong pieces of work as one would hope.

**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.

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

I was not at the board but no reason to believe it was not.

#### Other comments

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

<<>>

4 September 2015

Dear <<>>

Thank you for your recent report and for your encouraging comments about our programmes and the quality of the work produced by our students. We work hard to integrate teaching and research and I am glad that we have been able to demonstrate this to you by supporting students to conduct high-quality dissertation research and providing a range of modules informed by staff research.

Thank you also for your positive response to the changes we have made this year to the sampling of assessments for external examiners. We introduced them in response to feedback from our external examining team and they appear to have been well-received.

I have noted your comments about the university mentoring scheme. All external examiner reports are submitted to the University's Quality Assurance Team which has responsibility for appointing external examiners so they will be aware of your concern. Our student education team provide a great deal of support to external examiners so I am confident that any queries new examiners had were dealt with within the School.

Finally, I would like to thank you for your support over the past four years for our undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. I know my colleagues have very much appreciated the constructive feedback your have provided and your willingness to take on a range of modules.

Yours sincerely

<<>>

**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):	<i>Undergraduate and Postgraduate courses in law</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LAW2040 Company Law</li> <li>• LAW5445M International Competition Law</li> <li>• LAW5555M Advanced Corporate Law</li> <li>• LAW5568M International Corporate Governance</li> </ul>
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	LLB

**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*

Nothing has come to my attention

**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 Learning Outcomes and Programme Aims are commensurate with the level of the awards
  
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 programmes are comparable with other leading programmes across the UK  
  
N/A
  
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 marking has been consistent throughout the modules. On some occasions clearer relevance between the awarded mark and the assessment criteria was needed but the comment has been taken on board. The teaching, learning and assessment methods have been satisfactory
  
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 spread of marks and the spread of the classification has been comparable with other courses.
  
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.*

The teaching seems to be research led and to allow a variety of teaching methods to be used in the various modules
  
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.*

Yes it has been

- 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 have

- 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 have. The nature and level has been 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.

- 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?**

Yes

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

Yes to the best of my knowledge

## Other comments

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

<<>>

14 December 2015

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 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. Finally, it is worth mentioning that the central university is currently reviewing the 20-90 marking scale that we operate. I will keep you fully informed should any changes result.

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



**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):	LAW3120/3121 Jurisprudence LAW1260 Intro to Criminal law LAW2065/2066/3060 Criminal Law.
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	LLB

**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*

*The marking and classification processes were run smoothly and in the appropriate manner so there is nothing urgent to raise.*

**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*

n/a

## 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 as well as intended learning outcomes of both Jurisprudence and Criminal Law are commensurate with 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 satisfied that the programme meet the QAAHE Framework for HE Qualifications Law benchmark statement. It is also on a par with, and on occasion compares favourably to, other similar programmes in the UK.

In particular, I am satisfied that Jurisprudence meets the 2015 Subject Benchmark Statement requirement 1.4: "Law schools will determine for themselves how ethics are addressed in the curriculum, but it is expected that students will have opportunities to discuss ethical questions and dilemmas that arise in law and to consider the features of ethical decision making." I am also satisfied that both Jurisprudence and Criminal Law contribute to exposing "students to a wide range of methods and techniques, some of which are specific to the discipline but some of which are drawn from the humanities and social sciences."

### 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.*

Jurisprudence students are assessed partly by coursework (33%) and partly by unseen end-of-year exam on two topics, which they have selected to study during the year. Both methods of assessment are appropriately designed and structured and they correspond to the module's ILOs.

Criminal Law is assessed partly by group presentation. This was introduced in the 2014-15 academic session. The module convener has given me a full report of how the new assessment method worked and judging by the performance of the students as well, I am satisfied that the assessment of the course as a whole are appropriately designed and structured and they correspond to the module's 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.*

On the whole, the performance of the cohort was very good. I was particularly impressed with some scripts, which displayed a high degree of sophistication.

### 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.*

As mentioned above, assessment by group presentation was introduced in Criminal Law in 2014-15. I raised some possible issues with the course convener at the outset and it was quite clear both that she had planned the assessment method carefully and that she took on board my comments. I then received a detailed final report. Although it might be good to allow for the method to run for a couple more years to get a clearer sense, it seems that it has worked very well and, in fact, enhanced students' learning experience and their engagement with the course.

Regarding Jurisprudence, there were no substantial changes since 2013-14.

### 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.*

As I reported last year, one of the strengths of Jurisprudence is that colleagues teaching on the course focus on their research areas and this does not detract from the course's coherence.

Criminal Law is slightly different, because of the nature of the course –certain things need to be taught. Nevertheless, it is quite obvious that colleagues teaching on the course are expert researchers in the criminal law.

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 the necessary material was made available to me and both academic and administrative staff were always available and willing to provide further information upon my request.

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. It might be worth considering reducing to an absolute minimum the circulation of material in hard copy. Electronic versions will do just as well.

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, the nature and level of questions were appropriate in both modules.

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?

One of the things I flagged up in 2013/14 was that there was not always a clear indication of double marking. This was largely addressed this year.

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

The dissertations I read were on appropriate subjects and the method and standard of assessment were appropriate. The quality of some of the dissertations I read was impressive.

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 did attend the meeting and was once again impressed with how efficiently it was run.

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

The School continues to have a fair and considerate process of dealing with mitigating circumstances. The anonymity issue, which I raised in last year's report, is still outstanding.

#### Other comments

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

To repeat and emphasise, on the whole, the standards and process of assessment and classification have been consistently appropriate and fair.

<<>>

14 December 2015

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 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. Finally, it is worth mentioning that the central university is currently reviewing the 20-90 marking scale that we operate. I will keep you fully informed should any changes result.

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