

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	Leeds University Business School
Subject(s):	<i>Management Consulting</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Management Consulting, LUBS5588MO1, LUBS5590MO1, LUBS5592MO1, LUBS5594MO1
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.
 Quality and detail of student feedback on assessment consistently good. Marking quality and standards consistently good

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 – this is my first year as external examiner

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

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

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

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?	<u>Y</u> / N
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	<u>Y</u> / N
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	<u>Y</u> / N
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	<u>Y</u> / N
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	<u>Y</u> / N
Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	<u>Y</u> / N
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) This was most visible with the student projects, where the topics examined were generally linked to research interests of staff		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	<u>Y</u> / <u>N</u>
Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD: As a specialist master degree the MSc Management Consulting has the potential		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	<u>Y</u> / <u>N</u>
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)?	<u>Y</u> / N
Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here: I am unsure if the MSc Management Consulting is accredited by any professional body.		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	<u>Y</u> / N
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. Assessment methods are appropriate for the topics that are taught, and achieve a good balance between academic rigour and practical relevance		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	<u>Y</u> / N

19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	<u>Y</u> / N
<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>		
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i>		

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

Other comments

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

The organization of the exam board was very efficient, and criterion for award decisions was clear, and applied consistently. I liked the module review process where overall marks for each module were reviewed and compared to previous years. One suggestion for consideration is the case of students whose overall GCA falls just under the discretionary band, i.e 4.88 or 4.89, 5.88, 5.89. A few such cases occurred, and when looking at the grade profile of such students they were very similar to students

just falling inside the discretionary band. In such cases I wondered whether it would be possible to review individual cases and consider applying discretion, to allow such students to be considered for the higher grade, for example, whether they did a dissertation/project which was graded in the higher band.

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

LUBSLeeds University Business School
Maurice Keyworth Building
University of Leeds
LS2 1JT

*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 your positive comments on the programme and assessment methods. This was the first year that the MSc. Management Consulting Programme had run, and it is good to receive external feedback that the programme is running effectively.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

None, this is the first year of the programme

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:

None

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:

Thank you for the positive comments on the programme.

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:

It is good to receive feedback that standards on the programme are comparable to other similar programmes.

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:

Thank you for the work on assessing samples of scripts and exam/coursework papers. Your feedback that

assessment and feedback are good is welcome.

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:

Other comments

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

Thank you for your work in your first year as external examiner, which was also the first year that the MSc. Management Consulting Programme had run.

The rules for academic discretion at postgraduate level in LUBS are currently under review. A consultation process has been implemented, culminating in a proposal for changes to be presented at FEG in September for discussion at senior management level