

**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:	Leeds University Business School
Subject(s):	Marketing
Programme(s) / Module(s):	LUBS0030 Introduction to Marketing LUBS1095 PT for Marketing LUBS1860 Fundamentals of Marketing LUBS2010 Consumer Behaviour LUBS2160 Principles of Marketing LUBS2840 Market Research LUBS2850 Marketing LUBS3190 International Marketing LUBS3530 Advertising & Promotional Mgmt LUBS3845 Marketing Strategy
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BA/BSc

**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*

This has been my third year and there has been some changes over the last 12 months:

1. LUBS3190 International Marketing – following my comments last year, the quality and amount of feedback on the exam papers has improved. Additionally, less marks were awarded for repeating lecture material and more emphasis was placed on independent reading and study for the higher marks.

Further improvement could still be made in the following areas:

1. A wider variety of assessment with much less reliance on examinations. There is scope to introduce assessment which also develop students digital skills (improving their employability skills) such as videos, podcasts, wikis etc
2. Whilst there has been an improvement in the quality of feedback over the last 2 years, for some modules this could still be improved. I'd recommend the use of electronic marking for coursework as this can reduce time and increase the amount and quality of feedback provided to the students

3. It was good to see MGT3190 increasing the expectation of wider reading and research, however, these needs to be addressed across all modules. It is still surprising to see that none of the coursework assessment criteria includes the range and appropriateness of reading or referencing skills. It was clear from some of the second assessments students are unaware of which sources are appropriate for use in an academic piece of work and which are not.

## 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 module aims and ILO were appropriate for both the year of assessment and the standard of the University. I can only comment on this at the module level as I was not given any information on the different programme aims and ILO to review collectively.

### 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.*

At the module level the aims and ILO were comparable with other similar institutions and against national 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.*

As detailed last year (and above) the assessments were heavily weighted to examinations. There is scope to move to a wider variety of assessment, including new digital formats such as podcasts, videos or wikis. Overall the design of the assessment was reasonable, as mentioned in previous years LUBS2010, LUBS2160 and LUBS2850 could consider updating their cases studies.

There has been an improvement in the amount of feedback provided, specifically on the exam scripts but there were still instances (LUBS2010, LUBS3530, LUBS3845) where it was not evidence that a script had been second marked from the script. Overall the range of marks given was good and the level of consistency of marking was excellent.

Unfortunately this year there were more administrative errors than before. For LUBS2010 I was sent all of the coursework, not a sample and the scripts indicated on the external examiners form were related to the grades from LUBS2840 which caused a considerable amount of confusion. On two of modules (LUBS2840 and LUBS3845) marks had been changed but no explanation was provided. It was not clear whether just individual scripts had been reviewed and changed as part of the second marking or whether all scripts at the grade/classification had been reviewed and those scripts thought to be out of line were adjusted. This could have been easily achieved with more information on the spreadsheets of the original grades and final grades.

### 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.*

All of the assessment allowed for the distinguishing of strong and weak students. There were some excellent pieces of work which were awarded accordingly. The weaker students appeared, although this could not be confirmed, to be those whose first language was not English. These students tend to perform worse in examinations than coursework and therefore this is another reason to consider the balance of assessments.

Whilst there were some excellent answers at all levels I would have expected (as detailed above), especially at final year, for the students to have advanced their reading beyond the text books and for them to show evidence of this (usually through appropriate referencing) in both examinations and coursework. The lack of independent examples and the corresponding reliance on examples from lectures and text books only assesses the lower levels of understanding. As detailed above for LUBS3190 there has been some improvement here. Overall the full range of marks was used.

### 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 detailed above LUBS3190 move for students to show independent reading and research for the higher grades has been a positive move and other modules should follow this. I am also aware that there is an intention to move away from examination in some modules to diversify the range of assessments which is good.

**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.*

I saw little evidence of this through the assessments viewed. As detailed above there was little requirement for students to engage with the current practitioner material to provide examples of academic models/concepts/theories being applied in practice. Most examples were from core material and some were very old.

**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.*

Overall the level of material is sufficient, however, when it has been necessary to amend grades through the second marking/moderation process additional information is required and not always provided.

**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.*

Having access to Blackboard was helpful to provide more information on each module. I have not received any information on the programmes which these modules feed into.

**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 saw all draft exam papers and courseworks and all were 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?**

I received a sufficient number of scripts to have confidence in my evaluation of the standard of student work. The sheet which is completed by the 1<sup>st</sup> marker and moderator in most instances lacked any real helpful information. It usually just said a meeting was held. More information on how many scripts were moderated, any issues which arose, a detailed explanation of why marks were changed (individual or across the module) and what will be changed for next year to prevent this happening again would be more useful.

**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 attend the subject and final board. Generally throughout the year the arrangements were excellent, both <<>> and <<>> were extremely helpful and always quick to respond. It was good to see there were less special circumstances brought to the external board this year (following comments from previous year) but there were still a small number.

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

It was good to see that there has been further improvements to this system from the previous year to ensure a level of consistency of decisions between the various subject boards.

**Other comments**

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

I would like to thank <> and <> for their support. Also thanks to <>, <> and <> for their company and excellent discussion during the day of the exam boards. It was very helpful to meet the module leaders to discuss their modules in more detail.

Leeds University Business School

Maurice Keyworth Building  
University of Leeds  
Leeds LS2 9JT

W [business.leeds.ac.uk](http://business.leeds.ac.uk)



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

Thursday, 28 January 2016

***Reference: External Examination Report 2014-15***

Dear

Thank you very much for your Examiner's Report for the Management and Management with Marketing programmes. We are very pleased with your comments on our programme. In particular, I am happy that you found some improvement to have been made in the marking and criticality for some of the modules that you commented on last year.

We noted the following comments:

- **A wider variety of assessment with much less reliance on examinations. There is scope to introduce assessment which also develop students' digital skills (improving their employability skills) such as videos, podcasts, wikis etc.**

**Response:** We will review the range of assessments including digital approaches. At the moment, we do run voluntary workshops in digital marketing and Photoshop, which has very positive responses from students, but they do not appear in the external examination pack because they are unassessed. We use external, industry practitioners for this, to pique students' interest and ensure it is very current. This means that it is easier to keep them as unassessed for the moment. However, we are looking to build this in to assessment in the future.

- **Whilst there has been an improvement in the quality of feedback over the last 2 years, for some modules this could still be improved. I'd recommend the use of electronic marking for coursework as this can reduce time and increase the amount and quality of feedback provided to the students**

**Response:** the Business School is in the process of introducing online marking on all modules. There is already online submission for all UG students.

The Business School has also just revised its guidelines and policy on feedback: this refreshed policy was sent to all staff this week.

World Ranked – Triple Accredited – Award Winning



- **It was good to see MGT3190 increasing the expectation of wider reading and research, however, these needs to be addressed across all modules. It is still surprising to see that none of the coursework assessment criteria includes the range and appropriateness of reading or referencing skills. It was clear from some of the second assessments students are unaware of which sources are appropriate for use in an academic piece of work and which are not.**

**Response:** thank you for your positive comment about the changes on LUBS3190. Reflecting on your positive comments in LUBS3190, we shall seek to review whether similar improvements can be made across the programme.

- **As mentioned in previous years LUBS2010, LUBS2160 and LUBS2850 could consider updating their cases studies.**

**Response:** We acknowledge your concerns, and shall review this. I have already discussed this with the relevant module teams who have agreed to look to update their cases.

- **There were still instances (LUBS2010, LUBS3530, LUBS3845) where it was not evidence that a script had been second marked from the script**

**Response:** We shall ensure our processes are correctly applied and adhered to. I have contacted module staff to re-emphasise the importance of this.

- **Unfortunately this year there were more administrative errors than before. For LUBS2010 I was sent all of the coursework, not a sample and the scripts indicated on the external examiners form were related to the grades from LUBS2840 which caused a considerable amount of confusion. On two of modules (LUBS2840 and LUBS3845) marks had been changed but no explanation was provided. It was not clear whether just individual scripts had been reviewed and changed as part of the second marking or whether all scripts at the grade/classification had been reviewed and those scripts thought to be out of line were adjusted.**

**Response:** We appreciate your concerns regarding administrative errors; processes will be reviewed. There is an expectation for comments where grades are changed. This oversight will be followed up.

- **I would have expected (as detailed above), especially at final year, for the students to have advanced their reading beyond the text books and for them to show evidence of this (usually through appropriate referencing) in both examinations and coursework. The lack of independent examples and the corresponding reliance on examples from lectures and text books only assesses the lower levels of understanding**

**Response:** Reflecting on your positive comments in LUBS3190, we shall seek to review whether similar improvements can be made across the programme. This year, Marketing students are undertaking the dissertation as compulsory for the first time, which we hope will lift their engagement with the research literature.

- **I saw little evidence of this (influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching) through the assessments viewed. There was little requirement for students to engage with the current practitioner material to provide examples of academic models/concepts/theories being applied in practice. Most examples were from core material and some were very old**

**Response:** We acknowledge your concerns, and shall highlight your comments at a Divisional Learning and Teaching meeting.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your work.

Yours sincerely

Dean, Leeds University Business School