

## 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:          | Business School   |
| Subject(s):                   |   |
| Programme(s) / Module(s):     | LUBS5012M02 Research Methods<br>LUBS5013M01 Research Methods<br>LUBS5239M01 Executive Skills<br>LUBS5243M01 Leadership<br>LUBS5247M01 Managing for Innovation<br>LUBS5730M01 Entrepreneurship & Inn<br>LUBS5798M01 Dissertation<br>LUBS5835M02 Leading Change |
| 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?

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

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.*

All of the ILOs, structure and content were appropriate and 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.*

Definitely the aims and ILOs met the national benchmarks and are comparable with programmes in other 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.*

Of course, assessment vary from module to module. However, it is very good overall.

Some modules, as I mentioned last year, have been excellent innovation-wise as well as useful feedback-wise.

**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.

**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.*

There is a healthy continuity.

**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 impact of research and practice is evident in the materiel and in the exams.

**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?

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 admin staff, in particular Ms Dee Healey, have been very helpful and responsive.

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

NA

<<>>

08 April 2016

Dear <<>>,

Thank you very much for your Examiner's Report for the MBA, EMBA, and MSc Business Management programmes. We are very pleased with your comments on our programme. We are particularly pleased with the fact that you have highlighted that our teaching is informed by research and practice.

We greatly appreciate the assistance you have given to us.

Yours sincerely,

<<>>

**Dean  
Leeds University Business School**

*Tel: +44(0) 113 <<>>  
Fax: +44(0) 113 <<>>  
Email: <<>>*

**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 Business School

Subject(s):

| Module Code     | Module Title                     |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| LUBS5222M0<br>1 | E-business                       |
| LUBS5225M0<br>1 | Strategic Management             |
| LUBS5227M0<br>1 | Strategic Management (Heilbronn) |
| LUBS5229M0<br>1 | Management in Practice           |
| LUBS5712M0<br>1 | Management of Projects           |
| LUBS5737M0<br>1 | Strat & Entrepreneurial Mgt      |
| LUBS5762M0<br>1 | Man Consultancy                  |
| LUBS5873M0<br>1 | Strategic Management             |
| LUBS5887M0<br>1 | Knowledge Management             |
| LUBS5881M<br>01 | MBA Project                      |

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**

**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.

For the modules examined there were no cases in which the standards were not appropriate for the level 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.

All assessment is well design and appropriate. Student performance remains very strong.

**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.*

Not able to comment. My attention is upon individual modules.

**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. The only issue this year was around the grammar used by non-native speakers. I have commented on this and had an appropriate responses.

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 where 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.

<<>>

08 April 2016

Dear <<>>,

Thank you very much for your comments on our programmes. We were glad to read that you were satisfied with the standards and assessment design of our programmes. We also were grateful for your comment on the strength of student performance and quality of marking.

On behalf of the Division may I again thank you for your suggestions and comments. We greatly appreciate the assistance you have given to us.

Yours sincerely,

<<>>

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

*Tel: +44(0) 113 <<>>*

*Fax: +44(0) 113 <<>>*

*Email: <<>>*



**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):                   | <i>International Business</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*

Regarding the handling of student disputes, in light of this year's grievance issue, please bear in mind for the future that both the students and the external examiner should be involved in dialogue about how student concerns can be satisfactorily resolved without sacrificing academic quality or paedagogic value. I would, finally, emphasise that teaching teams need to develop collective standards through a friendly and collegial process of discussion and consensus

**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**

- 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 are appropriate, Some courses, however, are not using the full range of marks, with no failing grades and/or grades confined to a narrow 60-75 range.
- 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 objectives were in line with courses at this level.

**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 were appropriate and in line with those successfully used in previous years. Greater communication needs to be engaged in within larger marking teams to ensure a collective standard is agreed upon and maintained.

**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 performance of the students was, on the whole, in line with previous years.

**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.*

No new assessment methods were noted, but the use of case studies in assessment continues to be effective.

**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.*

Academics' research continues to inform teaching, and this is to be commended.

**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.*

In most cases, yes. However, in the case of LUBS5213, I was not made aware of a student grievance until quite late in the proceedings, when I should have been involved at a much earlier stage.

**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 not provided with at least one resit assignment for LUBS5213. While it is understandable due to changes in the administrative team, I would encourage greater vigilance in future.

**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, however, two of the sample dissertations' mark sheets were transposed.

**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, subject to the notes made above in #12 and #13.

**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**

I would like to thank the administrative staff for their tireless efforts, and also the programme director and lecturing team for their responsiveness to queries.

<<>>

08 April 2016

Dear <<>>,

Thank you very much for your Examiner's Report for the MSc International Business programme. We are very pleased with your comments that confirm the strength of the programme; in particular, you confirmed that the use of case studies in assessment continues to be effective and academics' research continues to inform teaching, and you also commented positively upon the responsiveness of the programme director and the lecturing team to queries during 2014/15.

We further noted the following comments that suggest areas of improvement:

**A** With regards to the handling of student disputes, e.g., the student's concerns regarding LUBS5213M this year, you commented that:

"Regarding the handling of student disputes, in light of this year's grievance issue, please bear in mind for the future that both the students and the external examiner should be involved in dialogue about how student concerns can be satisfactorily resolved without sacrificing academic quality or pedagogic value. I would, finally, emphasise that teaching teams need to develop collective standards through a friendly and collegial process of discussion and consensus"

"However, in the case of LUBS5213M, I was not made aware of a student grievance until quite late in the proceedings, when I should have been involved at a much earlier stage."

**Response:** First of all, we would like to thank you for offering your support in dealing with the recent matter. Members of the programme team have now been made fully aware of the importance of internal agreement, particularly that module leaders should follow latest LUBS code of practice (<https://lubswww.leeds.ac.uk/TSG/code-of-practice/>) and be rigorous with internal check marking and moderation process, and that the programme team should work together to resolve student concerns. We would also emphasise that we are always supportive in gaining external examiner input into issues arising, and where we are considering changing marks that have been submitted it is a requirement. Moving forward we will engage external examiner input at an earlier stage when addressing problems. For the programme team, all members have been made aware of this comment and the present Programme Director (PD) has generated the following action points for the academic year of 2015/16:

Based upon the latest LUBS code of practice (<https://lubswww.leeds.ac.uk/TSG/code-of-practice/>), the action taken and to be communicated to this year's cohort are as follows:

1. We will have a new more detailed rubric and guidelines in place for the professional skills module.
2. The oral presentation is proposed to account for 40% of the 10-credit professional skills module in 2016/17 (subject to school's approval in Feb 2016); for the present academic year of 2015/16, this assessment accounts for 20% of this 10-credit module (instead of 40% of a 30-credit module as in 2014/15).
3. MSc IB employability tutor and also module leader of the new 10-credit module above will act as second markers in ALL presentations along with the Personal Tutors who will act as first markers.
4. The students are given during the induction a detailed plan of whom to approach, when and how when they need to raise a complaint/query regarding their marks in one (or more) assessments. This procedure has been communicated to the staff and they will be reminded of the relevant LUBS's policies, marking procedures, and complaint procedures. This is described in the five steps below.
  - a. When a student has a complaint about a mark and the feedback, he/she contacts the module leader first.
  - b. The module leader agrees to meet with the student to explain in more detail what he/she did and didn't do to deserve the awarded mark.
  - c. If the student is unsatisfied he/she contacts the module leader explaining that he/she is not completely satisfied and subsequently the students and module leader contact the Programme Director.
  - d. The PD meets (phones or emails) the module leader so that <<>> can have a better picture of what was said with the student.
  - e. The PD meets the student and discusses with (reminds) him/her what the processes for marking, moderation of assessments and the role of the external examiner are. The PD also explains to the student the process of "the Student Complaints Procedure" ([http://www.leeds.ac.uk/secretariat/student\\_complaints.html](http://www.leeds.ac.uk/secretariat/student_complaints.html)) and the appeal, etc.
  - f. The divisional DSE in International Business is made aware of these issues as soon as possible.
  - g. If the issues persist the PD and the DSE will contact LUBS PG office (i.e. <<>> and/or <<>>) who in turn will facilitate the communication with the MSc IB External Examiner.

**B** With regard the range of marks, you commented that:

"The learning outcomes are appropriate, some courses, however, are not using the full range of marks, with no failing grades and/or grades confined to a narrow 60-75 range."

**Response:** All members of the programme team has been made aware of this comment and will closely monitor the range of marks used and will employ an effective second marking process to ensure marks are reasonably spread across the full range. Furthermore, the programme team will follow a recently implemented school level Guide on Assessment and Feedback where levels required to attain scores across the range of marks are articulated and guide on using these levels is provided to students and staff.

**C** You further commented on marking that:

"The assessment methods were appropriate and in line with those successfully used in previous years. Greater communication needs to be engaged in within larger marking teams to ensure a collective standard is agreed upon and maintained."

**Response:** All members of the programme team has been made aware of this comment and will work closely to agree upon a collective standards, and the present programme director will work with key module leaders to ensure that the practice is carried out effectively.

**D** You commented on assessment aspect that:

“I was not provided with at least one resit assignment for LUBS5213M. While it is understandable due to changes in the administrative team, I would encourage greater vigilance in future.”

**Response:** Thank you for this feedback, it is our policy to send all assessments to the external and we are aware that due to the timing of the paper and the issues with this module it was not sent in this instance. We will work to ensure in future you receive all documentation.

On behalf of the Division may I thank you again for your suggestions and comments; we greatly appreciate the assistance you have given to us.

Yours sincerely,

<<>>

**Dean  
Leeds University Business School**

*Tel: +44(0) 113 <<>>  
Fax: +44(0) 113 <<>>  
Email: <<>>*

## 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):

|           |                                      |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|
| 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):

**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?*

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 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. Many colleagues provided excellent feedback, but some not.

• It appears, on the basis of the assessments reviewed that the quality of the teaching and learning is good. My only comment is that whilst marking standards in general tend to be satisfactory, there is a tendency to be a little too generous around the pass/fail boundary.
  
- 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, there was not much evidence therefore of research informed teaching in these practice based modules. The dissertations and projects however 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**

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



**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 at the last board that the school needed to improve their projection facilities/software such that the screen was legible to external examiner and other board members. I was unable to attend the most recent board and hope that these matters had been addressed.

**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

<<>>

13 June 2016

Dear <<>>,

Thank you very much for your comments on our programmes. We are pleased that in general you were satisfied overall with the standard of marking, teaching and learning, the performance of our students, and that you found the dissertations and projects to be of a high standard.

We noted the following comments:

**A** Whilst marking standards in general tend to be satisfactory, there is a tendency to be a little too generous around the pass/fail boundary.

**Response:** This comment has been referred to the Faculty Assessment and Feedback working group to be looked at as a whole-School issue. This group is currently reviewing the marking criteria and guidance we give to PG students and markers, indicating levels required to attain scores across the range of marks. Once this piece of work has been completed, we will be happy to send you details.

**B** The administrative arrangements were satisfactory throughout. It was noted at the last board that the school needed to improve their projection facilities/software such that the screen was legible to external examiner and other board members. I was unable to attend the most recent board and hope that these matters had been addressed.

**Response:** I am pleased to inform you that this was taken note of from your previous comment and we have worked on creating a clearer presentation of results, as well as providing paper handouts.

On behalf of the Division may I again thank you for your suggestions and comments. We greatly appreciate the assistance you have given to us, and I look forward to welcoming you once more at next year's examination board.

Yours sincerely,

<<>>

**Dean  
Leeds University Business School**

*Tel: +44(0) 113 <<>>  
Fax: +44(0) 113 <<>>  
Email: <<>*

# 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:          | Business   |
| Subject(s):                   | <i>Management – Operations Management and related subjects</i>                             |
| Programme(s) / Module(s):     | LUBS5231, LUBS5231M, LUBS5242, LUBS5242M, LUBS5246, LUBS5757, LUBS5256M, MSc dissertations |
| Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc): | MSc/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*

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*

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 were appropriate for students studying at Level 5.

**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.*

A range of different assessment methods was used, including essays, applied reports, presentations and examinations. The first three enable both the assessment of learning and the development of transferrable skills by students. Examinations are important in assessing breadth of student knowledge and, regrettably, to ensure that at least some of the work presented by students for assessment is their own.

**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 work produced by the students was comparable both with the work I have seen in previous years from students at the University of Leeds, and with the work produced by students in my own institution. The dissertations I saw this year, from students on a joint programme based in Germany, were particularly strong, demonstrating on the whole very high levels of analysis and a very good grasp of research methods that in some cases moved beyond the basic techniques taught in most MSc research methods courses.

One weakness (not unique to Leeds) seems to be the lack of engagement of a small number of students at the tail of the distribution, and also some evidence that a few students are trying to get by with rote learning rather than developing good understanding. This is doubtless a function of previous educational experience but suggests that a few students are not fully understanding the needs of studying at Masters level in the UK.

**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.*

I particularly appreciated the information sent by some internal examiners providing details of the course and of the marking process, and highlighting

**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.*

**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

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. Where I needed advice it was freely and quickly given.

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. Copies of module handbooks were provided, and marking criteria/suggested outline answers were provided with all papers.

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. In all cases the assessments were appropriate to the level of students. I sometimes commented on the clarity of the questions asked and how marks were distributed between parts of questions, and sometimes had to point out grammar errors, but there were no issues with the level at which the assessments were pitched.

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 marked, although for students sitting on borderlines for courses overall I was sometimes provided only with one piece of work – it would have been easier to comment on the for marginal students I was sometimes provide

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

Subject choices were appropriate and marking was fair and consistent.

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, once again, very good and the administrative team looked after me well. I attended the meeting and was satisfied that the board worked hard to ensure that students were not disadvantaged. The detailing of problems with one or two courses (they happen) and the measures taken were particularly reassuring.

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

Where students had mitigating circumstances the cases were considered carefully. In a handful of cases this improved the outcome for the affected students, which I fully supported.

Other comments

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

<<>>

13 June 2016

Dear <<>>

Thank you very much for your Examiner's Report for the programmes. We we are very pleased with your comments on our programmes including the effectiveness of the range of assessment provided to our students and in particular your endorsement of the high quality dissertations produced by many of the Heilbronn MSc Business Management students. We were further pleased that you were satisfied with the communication provided by internal examiners and the administrative office.

We noted the following comments:

**A** I sometimes commented on the clarity of the questions asked and how marks were distributed between parts of questions, and sometimes had to point out grammar errors, but there were no issues with the level at which the assessments were pitched.

**Response:** This comment has been referred to the Faculty Assessment and Feedback working group to be looked at as this group is currently reviewing the marking criteria and guidance we give to PG students and markers, indicating levels required to attain scores across the range of marks. Once this piece of work has been completed, we will be happy to send you details.

**B** Scripts were clearly marked, although for students sitting on borderlines for courses overall I was sometimes provided only with one piece of work

**Response:** This comment has been referred to the Postgraduate Office to consider in relation to the range of scripts which are provided as a sample, in line with Faculty policy.

On behalf of the Division may I again thank you for your suggestions and comments. We greatly appreciate the assistance you have given to us.

Yours sincerely,

<<>>

**Dean  
Leeds University Business School**

*Tel: +44(0) 113 <<>>  
Fax: +44(0) 113 <<>  
Email: <<>>*