

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 13/07/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Law School

Subject(s):

Criminology & Criminal Justice

Programme(s) / Module(s):

CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE
CRIMINOLOGY & CRIMINAL JUSTICE (INTERNATIONAL)

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

BA/LLB

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.

Additional module on Technology, Crime and Justice

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 matters for urgent attention

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.

Overall the programme structure allows students to explore a range of core and optional modules as they progress through the programme. The modules, both core and optional, engage with a variety of contemporary issues in criminology and criminal justice providing a very good breadth and depth of engagement with material. Students engage with core modules on issues like Policing or Penology as well as optional choices in subjects like Youth, Crime and Justice or Mass Atrocities and Criminal Justice or Crime, Law and Social Change. The learning outcomes for modules are clear and they and the programme aligns with the national Criminology subject benchmarks.

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)

Research is embedded with the curriculum, the staff research interest in contemporary criminology thought and criminal justice are evident in the modules presented and the variety of topics within them. The influence of research is also apparent through the dissertation module and students are actively encouraged to (prepared at both level 4 and 5) to develop their own ideas and to engage with current literature and research- some undertaking their own empirical research as well as literature-based studies.

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
-----	---	---

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.

Assessments are clear, marking and feedback and moderation is also clear to the students and to me during this process. Overall the feedback to students is of good quality in places it is excellent not only in terms of what mark has been received but also in terms of development for future work (it is latter where sometimes this could be expanded). Across the modules I have seen there is a good variety of assessments, new modules have also developed a wider variety of assessment strategies and this gives more opportunity to develop a wider range of skills for example through policy reports, short tasks, poster presentations in addition to more standard essays and examinations, sometimes a wider range of essay titles could allow students to explore their own interests particularly at level 6.

Some modules are using step marking but others are not.

From what I have seen the students are treated fairly, assessed equitably at all stages of the process and the standards are comparable to peer institutions.

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

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:

Students are achieving very good and appropriate academic standards, at both the module level and when determining their overall degree classification on the programme. Marks are awarded appropriately in line with other comparable institutions. Overall, the criminology students perform very well, a strong cohort performance again this year and some exemplary pieces.

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:

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>		

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 Examiner:

Subject(s):

Law

Programme(s) / Module(s):

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

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 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

The scores in relation to assessment and feedback are good particularly when compared to the sector more widely. We have not introduced any particular innovations this year and believe good practice is merely a reflection of staff providing consistency. This is traditionally difficult to achieve but certainly there is evidence here that consistency brings results.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

You recognised the additional module Technology, Crime and Justice as an enhancement to the portfolio. Clearly we too feel this is an enhancement, though as is often the case with new modules the student feedback was somewhat mixed. We will draw upon this to make further enhancements as we feel the module generally is an excellent example of research based teaching.

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:

I would like to thank you for commitment to external examining during a challenging year, your helpful suggestions and advice have been most beneficial.

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.

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 regarding the quality of feedback. Our assessment and feedback scores have increased on BA and we are looking into the reasons for this more closely.

As regards categorical marking we will ensure that there is consistency across all modules and assessment methods as we introduce a slightly modified university wide scale.

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.

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:

Many thanks for your attendance at this year's Board, the attendance of external examiners adds an extra element of scrutiny and accountability which are vital for student confidence in the process. We also recognise what a busy time it is for academic staff, so again, thanks for your close attention and commitment to the process.

Other comments

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

I would like to reiterate my thanks for your commitment to external examining during a challenging period in 2017/18.