

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):	
Programme(s) / Module(s):	LUBS5012M02 Research Methods LUBS5013M01 Research Methods LUBS5225M01 Strategic Management LUBS5227M01 Strategic Management LUBS5229M01 Management in Practice LUBS5239M01 Executive Skills LUBS5712M01 Management of Projects LUBS5737M01 Strategic & Entrepreneurial Management LUBS5762M01 Management Consulting LUBS5830M01 Management in Action LUBS5872M01 Strategic Management LUBS5881M01 MBA Project LUBS5885M01 Management of Projects LUBS5889M01 Management Consulting LUBS5899M01 Business Project LUBS5988M01 Research Design and Analysis
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MSc Strategic Management in the Global Environment

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.

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 /
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?	/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.

It is a challenging postgraduate programme. It is of a comparable standard to those at similar institutions. The programme is coherent and meets the intended learning objectives.

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

I am not in a position at this stage to answer this question. I am not aware of the research interests of all of the staff who teach on the programme. As such, I am not aware therefore of how their respective research interests has influenced the content of each of the modules that I reviewed.

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

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

I am not aware that this programme has been designed for this purpose. The content of the programme, however, would provide a good subject knowledge for those students who intend to study 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:
N/A

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:
N/A

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y / N
<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>There was a very good range of assessment methods adopted which included exams, coursework, presentations as well as reflective pieces of work. These assessment methods allowed students to demonstrate their learning and knowledge of the subjects. The reflective assignments were particular interesting and allowed students to comment on their personal development through studying on this programme. The quality of the work demonstrates that the students were very well taught.</p> <p>You may wish consider what constitutes the zone of consideration for using discretion to award a degree at the higher level (merit or distinction). It is currently one mark on the borderline. Students appeared to be automatically awarded a degree at the higher level. It was not, however, clear what is the criteria in your exam conventions for making the award at the higher level. For example, should students have at least 50% of their credits in the higher category, or excellent performance in a research-based subject? You could also consider for an award at the higher category students who are two marks away on the borderline. This would obviously depend on the criteria in the exam conventions, or require changes to the conventions.</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 students have been set appropriate and demanding coursework and exams. The stronger students have demonstrated their engagement with the academic literature in both the exams and coursework, and have been awarded high marks to reflect this. The marks clearly distinguished between the excellent and the average student. I did, however, feel that some marks were a little high. This is partly due to the fact that the internal examiners appeared to be using two different assessment criteria. Some were using 'Postgraduate Level 5: LUBS Generic Assessment Criteria (FHEQ7) whilst others had adopted 'Assessment banding for Level M (Masters). It would be more appropriate for all examiners to use the same assessment criteria.</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>There was some excellent feedback provided to students. However, some of the feedback was not consistent with the marking criteria. For example, if a piece of work is assessed as 'outstanding' according to the marking criteria, then this should be reflected in the feedback provided to the student. A variety of feedback forms were used to provide feedback on the project/dissertation to the students. It would be helpful to develop a feedback template that is used by all supervisors to ensure coherence and consistency in feedback.</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 / N
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N
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> <p>I would suggest adopting a standard template for projects/dissertations to provide feedback to students.</p> <p>The administrative arrangements were excellent.</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*:

Faculty / School of:

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

Head of School	

*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

N/A

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:

We will endeavour to ensure external examiners are offered reports from previous years and a mentor to guide them through this process.

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, this is encouraging. The modules often draw on the specific research expertise of the module leader where appropriate and relevant, although this should not detract from the core content being taught. Students on this module have shown interest in further study at PhD level and it is agreed that they would be capable leading directly from this programme.

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 these useful insights. The comments about the quality of work produced by the students is very encouraging, especially given this is a small cohort and specialist programme which aims to recruit high-quality,

engaged students with a specific interest in strategic management. The comments about exam/award conventions can be passed on to relevant teams who are tasked with making these decisions. I'm sure this feedback will be very valuable.

With regard to high marks, this is encouraging again given the aim to recruit the highest quality students to specialist masters programmes. However, the assessment criteria needs to be addressed and this feedback is extremely valuable and will be noted, especially as we approach the dissertation period in semester three this year. We will be addressing the comments about coherence and consistency of feedback by discussing with other programmes to align with best practice, and to produce a standard template which ensures assessed work (e.g. outstanding, good) is reflected and consistent in the feedback provided to students. Examples will be also be given to those marking work as guidance, and we will establish a support network to discuss any concerns with the use of new marking templates/guidance.

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:

Thank you for these comments. Again, this is very useful and clearly something that needs to be addressed to ensure consistency in the current, and future years of the programme.

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