

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:	Leeds University Business School
Subject(s):	<i>Business Analytics and Decision Sciences</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MSc Business Analytics and Decision Sciences 5308M Business Analytics & Decision Science; 5309M Forecasting and Advanced Business Analytics
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MSc

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.

It is not obvious that there have been significant changes to the programme overall. However, I notice that one module (5311M: Sports Analytics) has not run for the past 2 years. This is a pity as it is a good example of a research-led module. Optional modules provide a good way of incorporating staff research into teaching, especially at the post graduate level, so the school should ensure there is a good selection of research focused options.

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

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Handbook?	Y / N
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses to these?	Y / N
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	Y / 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 an 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>The programme has a clear and coherent structure, and it is well designed. The aims and intended learning outcomes are entirely suitable for the level of the award and for the modules for which I have responsibility. The content of the modules is consistent with programme aims and intended outcomes, and samples of work I saw were of a standard expected for a post-graduate award. The programme delivers the key aims and intended learning outcomes that would be expected in similar programmes at good universities. The programme is designed to develop decision-oriented quantitative analytical skills and apply them within a business framework. The intended learning outcomes are consistent with this aim.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	N
<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>I noted two years ago that Module 5311M served as an excellent example of how to incorporate academic research into the curriculum and into learning/teaching. It is a shame that this module did not run again in 2016-17. If this module is not to be offered in future it would help to have a module replace it that also integrates staff research into learning/teaching and gives students the opportunity to apply research skills <i>outside of</i> a dissertation module. Post-graduate students in particular should see how the research of teachers is used to enhance their own learning.</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>Assessment strategies are appropriate given the intended learning outcomes and aims. The module assessments give students the opportunity to demonstrate knowledge of key concepts, methodologies, and quantitative techniques of analysis. In general, the modules I surveyed had appropriate assessment instruments, which were challenging and at the right level. The assessments tested analytical skills and an ability to interpret results obtained. The marking rigour exhibited by the course team was first class. There was evidence of moderation of the work. Student performance indicates high quality teaching and well designed assessments.</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>The work I saw showed that the performance of students on these modules is of a comparable standard to similar students at other institutions. The numerical skill of some students, as evidenced by their performance on quantitative questions, was of a high standard. The parts of questions that require reflection or critical reasoning were less well done overall, but this is not unique to</p>		

Leeds. As noted above, the assessments are designed to test a range of skills and allow the more able students to demonstrate higher level knowledge.

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:

The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiner's 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?	N
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

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:

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*:	Programme Director BA&DS
Faculty / School of:	<i>Leeds University Business School, Management Division</i>
Address for communication:	Maurice Keyworth Building Moorland Road Leeds, LS6 1AN
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

N/A

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

Unfortunately, we are restricted to only being able to offer five optional modules in total across the two semesters. All the modules that are offered benefit from the research activity of their respective teachers.

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:

N/A

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:

See response above on Enhancements.

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:

The programme team will review what might be done to address (the accepted non-Leeds-specific) issue of raising the quality of answers requiring reflection and/or critical reasoning.

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:

N/A

Other comments

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

N/A

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

<i>Faculty / School of:</i>	Leeds University Business School (LUBS)
<i>Subject(s):</i>	<i>Management</i>
<i>Programme(s) / Module(s):</i>	Programmes: MSc. Business Analytics and Decision Sciences MSc. Engineering Technology and Business Management MSc. Information systems and Information Management MSc. Global Innovation Management MSc. Management MSc. Strategic Management in a Global Environment MBA Programme Modules: LUBS5869M01 - Management Decision Making LUBS5709M01 - Management Decision Making LUBS5586M01 - Quantitative Analysis LUBS5253M01 - Advanced Decision Making LUBS5582M01 - Research Methods LUBS5318M01 - Evidence Based Consultancy LUBS5221M01 Effective Decision Making LUBS5202M01 - Risk Perception and Communication
<i>Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):</i>	MBA; MSc

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

Points of innovation and/or good practice

<p>I like the following areas of good practice and innovation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The generic feedback on exam papers and coursework assignments provided by markers. The written dialogue between markers concerning quality assurance on module assessments. The high quality of the top-marked exam papers and coursework assignments.
--

Enhancements made from the previous year

<p>I thought the generic feedback on coursework assignments was generally more extensive than has sometimes been the case in the last couple of years, which is good. I didn't notice any other specific enhancements from last year though.</p>
--

Matters for Urgent Attention

None

For Examiners in the first year of appointment **N/A**

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

For Examiners completing their term of appointment **N/A**

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 an 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

The programmes I examined work on are well-run with appropriate assessments in place. The marking quality assurance procedures are robust and rigorous. There is some good evidence of professional practice and staff research interests and expertise informing a number of the coursework assignments I saw.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
-----	---	---

Yes: for example, the coursework assignments concerning case studies of professional organisations is demonstrative of the research interests and knowledge of lecturers on the programmes.

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
-----	--	---

Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
-----	--	---

Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:

16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
-----	--	---

Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
-----	---	---

The assessment methods seem appropriate to their ILOs in terms of their structure and design. The modules are marked fairly and rigorously in line with good-practice principles. The quality of the work produced by students across the modules is good and indicative of the overall high academic quality of students on the programmes.

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>The students typically produced good quality work across the modules, with some really good pieces of work being evident among the samples I reviewed. Not being involved in other Business Studies programmes, I cannot comment on the relative performance of LUBS students to students on comparable programmes at other HEIs.</p>		
<p>I made some more specific comments on the module coursework assignment report sheets I completed prior to the Validation Day, so please refer to those documents. The gist of these comments concerned feedback on coursework assignments; for example, the lack of in-text comments on a number of assignments on more than one module. Overall, I feel that there is some room for improvement in terms of providing feedback on coursework assignments in specific places where weaknesses occur in the text rather than just using more generic comments in a text-box on the assignment feedback sheet to alert students to what they did and didn't do so well on and how they can improve in the future.</p>		

The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiner's 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?	N/A
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	N/A
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?	N
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	N/A
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	N/A
None		

Other comments

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

None

Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report

QAT Received 15/08/2018

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Faculty / School of:

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

Programme Director BA&DS

Leeds University Business School, Management Division

Maurice Keyworth Building
Moorland Road
Leeds, LS6 1AN

**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 gat@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

Thank you for highlighting the areas of good practice.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

We are pleased that you have seen an improvement in feedback on assignments.

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:

N/A

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:

N/A

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:

The programme team notes the suggestions for fuller and more specifically targeted, in-text feedback to indicate weaknesses in coursework assignments and will implement changes going forward.

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:

N/A

Other comments

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

N/A