

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	LAW
Subject(s):	CRIMINOLOGY / LAW
Programme(s) / Module(s):	CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE CRIMINOLOGY & CRIMINAL JUSTICE (INTERNATIONAL)
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BA / LLB

Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards

Points of innovation and/or good practice

Please highlight areas of innovation or good practice within the programmes or processes you have been involved with in this box.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.

FIRST REPORT

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

NO MATTERS FOR URGENT ATTENTION

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiners Handbook?	Y
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?	N
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	N

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	Y / N
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	Y / N
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y / N
7.	Have you acted as a External Examiner Mentor?	Y / N

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

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	Y
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Y
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y
<p><i>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</i></p> <p>Overall the modules within the programme demonstrate a very good breadth and depth of engagement with contemporary criminological and criminal justice issues. Students engage with core modules on issues like Policing or Penology as well as optional choices in subjects like Youth, Crime and Justice or Mass Atrocities and Criminal Justice or Crime, Law and Social Change. The learning outcomes for modules are clear and they and the programme align with the national Criminology subject benchmarks.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<p><i>Please explain how this is/could be achieved (examples might include: curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research).</i></p> <p>Overall the curriculum engages with key contemporary issues across a range of modules and draws on current and ongoing research in the subject areas. The key method through which the influence of research is shown is on the dissertation module. Students are appropriately prepared at levels 4 and 5 and at level 6 are encouraged to develop their own ideas (with supporting supervisor) and engage with current literature and research - the performance on this module was very good, just under half achieved a grade of 70% or more.</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i></p>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i></p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i></p>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<p><i>Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs, in particular: the design and structure of the assessment methods, and the arrangements for the marking of modules and the classification of awards; the quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods that may be indicated by student performance.</i></p> <p>Assessments are clear, marking and feedback and moderation is also clear to the students. Overall the feedback to students is good (there is some variation of how this is communicated to students) but the quality of the feedback is good, in some places excellent. There is a good variety of assessments, though my impression is that there is a slant towards more examinations (some 100% exam modules), however, the introduction and development of a wider variety of types of assessment across modules in recent years is welcomed and gives students the opportunity to develop and demonstrate a wider range of skills for example through policy reports, short tasks, presentations in addition to more standard essays and examinations.</p> <p>From what I have seen the students are treated fairly, assessed equitably at all stages of the process and the standards are comparable to peer institutions.</p>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y

19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y
<p><i>Please comment on 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:</i></p> <p>Students are achieving very good and appropriate academic standards, at both the module level and when determining their overall degree classification. There was a good range of marks given and these were given appropriately, on the whole a strong cohort performance this year in terms of classification. There was also a very good performance in the dissertation module as a whole, some exemplary pieces which really showed how students have been supported to independently engaged with a topic of their choice.</p> <p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i></p>		

The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiners role, powers and responsibilities in the examination process?	Y
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Y
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p>		

Other comments

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

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Responder:	
Position*:	Director of Student Education
Faculty / School of:	<i>ESSL School of Law</i>
Address for communication:	School of Law University of Leeds Leeds LS29JT
Email:	
Telephone:	

*If the individual responding to the report is not the Head of School please state their position within the School.

Completing the School response

The completed School response (including the full original report) should be attached to an e-mail and sent to the Pro-Dean for Student Education in the relevant Faculty. Following approval by the Pro-Dean for Student Education, the School must send the response (including the full original report) directly to the External Examiner. A copy must also be emailed to the Quality Assurance Team at qat@leeds.ac.uk. External Examiners should receive a formal response no later than six weeks after receipt of the original report.

Response to Points of innovation and/or good practice

By way of a general comment, we recognise that we can do more in relation to feedback - and this year we are addressing a somewhat opaque set of marking criteria and are moving to online marking across the board. This will hopefully ensure the marking standards are clearer still and can be more easily explained to students.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

Again, a further general comment would be that our plagiarism detection has been more timely. We ran into some problems the previous year which didn't allow much time for considered decision making – this year we made it a priority to get this right.

Response to Matters for Urgent Attention

If any areas have been identified for urgent attention before the programme is offered again please provide a specific response to them here:

N/A

Response to questions 1-7 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

In reference to the Handbook and external examiners reports – this is something we need to check as a school and we will ensure that in addition to providing materials for new externals we will provide links for ongoing externals to find other externals' reports and comments.

Standards**Response to questions 8 to 16 (and related comments)**

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

Thank you for confirming the standards of the degree – this is, of course, absolutely at the core of the external examiner process and we are very pleased to have your endorsement on this.

Assessment and Feedback

Response to questions 17 to 19 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

Issues related to assessment and feedback are perennially an issue on student evaluation questionnaires. It is very pleasing to note your response but we are aware that there is more we need to do. A thorough evaluation of the marking criteria is being undertaken – developing level specific criteria – categorical marking is being rolled out to aid transparency and certainty, and online marking is designed to enhance the quality of feedback through the potential to cross reference to other useful resources.

The Progression and Awards Process

Response to questions 20-35 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

Many thanks for your attendance at this year's Board, the attendance of external examiners adds an extra element of scrutiny and accountability which are vital for student confidence in the process. We also recognise what a busy time it is for academic staff, so again, thanks for your close attention and commitment to the process

Other comments

Response to items included in the 'Other Comments' section of the report

Many thanks for your work and the flexibility you have shown in completing our external scrutiny process. We very much look forward to continuing to work with you and taking on board any suggestions you might have.