

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 22/11/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Law

Subject(s):

PG Law

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Corporate Finance and Securities Law (PG); Corporate Social Responsibility (PG); Long Dissertation (PG)

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

PGT Programmes – taught LL.M.

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.

Excellent levels of feedback. Constructive and detailed comments were always provided to the students. I feel that the electronic marking system has helped in improving the quality of feedback. In particular, it is useful that comments can be added throughout the script, but also at the end.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

Using the online system Minerva was certainly a more efficient way of reviewing the scripts.

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

N/A.

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>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</p> <p>The standards on these Master's modules are certainly comparable to those I have seen at other institutions. The standards are, quite rightly, high and the expectation is that PG students will be challenged. This is a healthy attitude and ought to be encouraged. The aims and objectives of each module are clearly defined and the teaching and assessments clearly allow those to be met.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<p>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)</p> <p>There is clear evidence of research-led teaching on these PGT modules. All of the modules deal with technical and very specialist areas of law. Thus, a research element is needed to deliver them effectively and this is evident throughout each syllabus.</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<p>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</p> <p>N/A.</p>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
<p>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</p> <p>N/A.</p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y
<p>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</p> <p>N/A.</p>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<p>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.</p> <p>The assessment instruments are effectively designed and well-pitched. The marking, moderation and feedback processes are also rigorous and meticulous.</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>I reviewed some excellent pieces of work this year. Credit should go to both the teaching team and the students. The assessments were challenging and intellectually stimulating. They definitely allowed the students to shine. It seemed clear to me that many students stepped up to the challenge and responded accordingly. The assessed work demonstrated high levels of critical engagement and there was evidence of an array of wider reading.</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>Again, just to reiterate how impressed I was by the care and attention demonstrated by the teaching team towards marking and feedback. Positive and constructive comments will help students to improve in the future which is crucial.</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
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>N/A.</p>		

Other comments

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

I have once again enjoyed acting as an external at PGT level for the Leeds Law School. I always look forward to seeing such interesting pieces of work from students and the efficiency with which the PGT programmes are run is clear for all to see. It is slightly annoying having to submit a separate EE report for PG and UG. It may be useful if some way could be found to combine the two. Equally, it is a little frustrating to have to fill out claim forms every year. Surely this should only need to be done once and our bank details etc. saved for future use. Other than that, a very pleasurable experience and a big thanks to the excellent admin support.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)*Title and Name of Examiner:*

Subject(s):

Law

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

LLB

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Director of Student Education

Faculty / School of:

ESSL, School of Law

Address for communication:

School of Law
The Liberty Building
University of 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

This year has been a challenging one in respect of the delivery and marking of assessment work during the period of industrial action. With the University we developed a process to assure quality and integrity of the assessment process could be maintained. The role of our External Examiners was crucial in this respect and we are extremely grateful for your effort in this regard. The integrity of the assessment process is critical on many levels but most particularly students must have confidence in the process. This year we were able to maintain and even bolster confidence through the strict processes invoked.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

Many thanks for your comments. We have made some relatively minor changes this year including tweaks to assessment practices and a new dissertation allocation process. Of course we hope these will have a positive impact but we are mindful that we do not want to change for change sake. Our new Centre for Innovation and Research in Legal Education will be the 'think tank' for future curriculum developments and we hope this more research based approach to innovation will prove even more successful.

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:

This is something that we will action for the coming year.

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:

I would like to thank you for commitment to external examining during a challenging year.

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 for confirming the standards of the degree – this is, of course, absolutely at the core of the external examiner process and we are very pleased to have your endorsement on this.

I will pass on your comments relating to research led teaching on LAW3129 Health Care Law to the module team.

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:

It is pleasing to note your response relating to assessment and feedback, although you have noted that the methods of assessment relate to the intended learning outcomes, we will be doing more to ensure this is the case going forward. As a School we will be committing to the Leeds Expectations for Assessment and Feedback programme, designed to improve assessment and feedback measures to ensure students receive useful and meaningful feedback which they are able to act upon in future assessments. As part of this, we will be undertaking an assessment mapping exercise which will ensure all methods of assessment directly link to the learning outcomes of the module and wider outcomes of the programme.

Again, although not directly applicable to your comments, we are making an assessment and feedback guidance tutor appointment to pilot different forms of feedback beginning with a project to deliver feedback within 24 hours. It is hoped this will provide relevant, readily available feedback reflecting today's culture of instant access to information.

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:

The many different methods that Universities employ for progression and awards certainly ensures that this aspect of external examining can be more complex than it needs to be. However, I am pleased that this was clear. Thank you again for your work and the flexibility you have shown in completing our external scrutiny process.

Other comments

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

Many thanks for your comments, I will pass your thanks on to our administrative and teaching colleagues.

I would like to reiterate how grateful we are for your commitment to external examining during a challenging period in 2017/18.