

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

<i>Faculty / School of:</i>	Business School
<i>Subject(s):</i>	<i>Management</i>
<i>Programme(s) / Module(s):</i>	MSc Management MSc Business Management (Part-time) MBA Business Administration MBA Business Administration (Executive) LUBS5231M01 Managing Global Logistics and Supply Chains LUBS5238M01 Operations and Supply Chain Management LUBS5242M01 Managing and Designing Value Chain Networks LUBS5257M01 Managing Change (Year 1 & 2) - for 1011 LUBS5757M01 Leading in Practice LUBS5826M01 Operations and Information Management LUBS5835M01 Leading Change LUBS5986M01 Operations, Information Systems and Innovation LUBS5798M01 Project/Dissertation LUBS5251M01 Project (Year 2)
<i>Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):</i>	MSc/MBA

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

Points of innovation and/or good practice

The Progression & Awards Boards were held in a very professional manner.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

Matters for Urgent Attention

None

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

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

3.	Were you provided with an 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 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 programmes appear to be well thought through with appropriate aims and learning outcomes.

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)

Especially in some of the Projects.

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
<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>Marking and feedback was fair and appropriate. Projects sometimes were poorly conceived and structured resulting in the final reports lacking in cohesion and quality</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>Some excellent work being presented by part-time students on a course delivered in another country.</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> <p>Some inconsistency in the use of marking and feedback sheets on the Project/Dissertation module – several forms seem to be in circulation and it would be far better if one form was used across the module.</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
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i>		
It would be preferable to receive module assessment questions for approval in one batch for each semester rather than the piecemeal approach adopted at present.		

Other comments

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

An interesting and enjoyable experience in my first year.

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:	Business School
Subject(s):	<i>Marketing modules</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MSc Management MSc Business Management (Part-time) MBA Business Administration MBA Business Administration (Executive) LUBS5210M01 Marketing for Management2 LUBS5211M01 Marketing Management (Year 1) LUBS5249M01 Creative Industries Management LUBS5422M01 Consumer Behaviour across Cultures LUBS5747M01 Global Marketing Management LUBS5775M01 Sales Management LUBS5851M01 Marketing LUBS5852M01 Marketing
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MSc, MBA

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

Points of innovation and/or good practice

Modules are designed in a comprehensive manner and cover a wide range of issues. Even though I am looking at various marketing modules, I can clearly see a very distinct identity to each module. This shows a clear mapping of content across the program which is not always the case in other departments. I think the school is doing a great job in providing the basis for the program but also pushing the common practices forward. Some modules are very specialized and offer an interesting link to industry. An example of this is the creative industries management.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.
N/A It is my first year.

Matters for Urgent Attention

There is no major issue that concerns me.
The only case that I was involved with was students' complains on 5852M. The marking was however consistent. A more clear assessment guideline for this year can be helpful.

The only issue that needs attention is slightly generous marks on the top end of the scale (high 70s and 80s) which is not very consistent across modules. I believe the school should have a more specific marking criteria and definition of "what is means" to mark a piece at 80%.

--

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

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

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

<p><i>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</i></p>

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 am associated with marketing modules across different programmes, hence, I can only comment on individual modules. The marketing fundamentals required for a management program and necessary for a graduate from a management degree are covered. Additionally, more specific courses are offered to students. Overall I am very pleased with the level of marketing modules. Learning outcomes are tested through the assessments and meet the national standard. Indeed a number of very high quality work is produced. Design of marketing modules and their assessments allow an in-depth learning experience for students.</p>

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

<p><i>The quality of assessments is an indicator of research informed curriculum. A number of assessments have a very practical approach to business practice which I believe are of great benefit to students. The only element that I would have like to see more, maybe biased by my area of research, is incorporation of digital platforms in the curriculum. Certain marketing modules could reflect more on changes in traditional marketing tactics, implementation and monitoring.</i></p>

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	Y
<i>Marketing modules provide an appropriate base for students interested in this area. Again, I cannot comment on a particular program.</i>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N/A
<i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	
I believe there is an accreditation, but I am not aware of any particular one.		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<i>Learning outcomes are clearly tested through the assessments. What I like about most of the assessments is their broadness that encourages students to be more innovative. The level and amount of assessments are appropriate. One of the strength of these programs are I diversity of type of assessment. Marketing is consistent and fair. As I mentioned earlier on, Marks at high 70s are too generous compared to other institutions. Students have performed very well which shows the hard work of staff. I would like to see more evidence of internal moderation.</i>		
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
<i>Some very good quality work was produced by the students. Similar to majority of Schools, student's capabilities are diverse.</i>		
The team is doing a great job in terms of assessment and feedback. The level of feedback that students receive are not always in the same level.		

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?	NA
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	NA
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

One comment I would like to make is the efficiency of the board meeting. I am very pleased with the procedure and answers provided by the program directors. Most importantly, I found the procedure to be fair towards students. A number of procedural changes were discussed in the board which I hope would even raise the standard higher.

Other comments

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

-

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

I like the following areas of good practice and innovation:

- 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

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.

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