

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																		
<i>Subject(s):</i>	<i>Information Systems and Information Management</i>																		
<i>Programme(s) / Module(s):</i>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;">Module Code</th> <th>Module Name</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>LUBS5222M01</td><td>E-Business</td></tr> <tr><td>LUBS5237M01</td><td>Operations Management</td></tr> <tr><td>LUBS5277M01</td><td>Information Tools for Organisations</td></tr> <tr><td>LUBS5279M01</td><td>Challenges in Information Management</td></tr> <tr><td>LUBS5312M01</td><td>Designing Information Systems</td></tr> <tr><td>LUBS5313M01</td><td>Systems Thinking</td></tr> <tr><td>LUBS5752M01</td><td>Global Operations and Information Management</td></tr> <tr><td>LUBS5824M01</td><td>Operations & Information Management</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Module Code	Module Name	LUBS5222M01	E-Business	LUBS5237M01	Operations Management	LUBS5277M01	Information Tools for Organisations	LUBS5279M01	Challenges in Information Management	LUBS5312M01	Designing Information Systems	LUBS5313M01	Systems Thinking	LUBS5752M01	Global Operations and Information Management	LUBS5824M01	Operations & Information Management
Module Code	Module Name																		
LUBS5222M01	E-Business																		
LUBS5237M01	Operations Management																		
LUBS5277M01	Information Tools for Organisations																		
LUBS5279M01	Challenges in Information Management																		
LUBS5312M01	Designing Information Systems																		
LUBS5313M01	Systems Thinking																		
LUBS5752M01	Global Operations and Information Management																		
LUBS5824M01	Operations & Information Management																		
<i>Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):</i>	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.
 The use of current topics has been integrated very well. Use of Activity Theory as soft methodology illustrated innovative and research led teaching and learning.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

1. Removed the choice between Operations and Analytics in Semester1
2. Replaced one of the Sem 2 optional modules with a new core module on ISIM

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

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

Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.

The MSc in IS and IM is current however, element of IS is not so strong. The softer aspect of IS is more prominent rather than technical IS aspects.

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

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)

Yes, this is very well integrated.

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

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.

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><i>The design and structure of the assessment methods are appropriate however, there should be multiple methods of assessment. Currently, this is dominated by assignments/coursework.</i></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 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?	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 / N
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>For point 35; there were few decisions that were told in haste and not much time given for discussion.</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*:	Programme Director (201617 and 201718 respectively), MSc Information Systems and Information Management
Faculty / School of:	<i>Leeds University Business School</i>
Address for communication:	Leeds University Business School Maurice Keyworth Building University of Leeds Leeds LS2 9JT
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 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

It is gratifying to see that the use of current theory , and the application of that theory in current research contributing both to literature and practice is recognised. This is something the course team value and seek to protect.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

Changes made in the structure are in response to student feedback and will, of course , be revisited as the demands of the student body and discipline dictate

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:

No specific issues raised

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:

No specific issues raised

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:

No specific issues raised

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:

We note your comments for future boards. For clarification, LUBS operates a robust pre-board system which allows for extended discussion of every student with special circumstances of which there are a significant number against their profile. Based on this a recommendation is made in relation to which cases need to be flagged and discussed in detail at the main board, taking into account; the special circumstances, the student profile and the distance from the discretionary boundary.

There were 37 students with mitigating circumstances who were considered fully at the PG pre-board.

Other comments

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

No specific issues raised. The course team will seek to build on the strengths of the programme and incorporate new areas of theoretical and practice development as they arise.

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