

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18      QAT Received 05/07/2018

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

<i>Faculty / School of:</i>	Business
<i>Subject(s):</i>	Business Law and Employment Law
<i>Programme(s) / Module(s):</i>	BA HRM/ BA Mgment and HR/ LUBS2810 & LUBS3915
<i>Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):</i>	BA HRM/ BA Mgment and HR

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

**Points of innovation and/or good practice**

The process is fair and transparent. Students appear well aware of what is required. The method of assessments in the modules are appropriate, and the standards are certainly in line with comparable institutions.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

This was my first occasion attending the Board in person, so I cannot comment on previous years. I have been consistently impressed with the standards in the modules I examine.

**Matters for Urgent Attention**

N/a

**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
<p>I examine at a modular (law-based) rather than programmatic level. However, the law-based modules fit very well within the programmes offered, and complement the students focus on Management/HR, etc.</p> <p>I am very familiar with Business programmes with law components, and find the standards at LUBS to be excellent. The LOs are clearly-defined, and in line with comparable programmes elsewhere.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<p>It is clear that the students are lectured in accordance very up-to-date materials (for example, one question was set in anticipation of an impending Supreme Court judgment, which was clearly flagged to the students, and was incorporated into student answers. This points to the need for students to do independent research after the conclusion of formal teaching).</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i></p>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i></p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i></p> <p>NOTE: I am not familiar with requirements for Business programmes.</p>		

## Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<p>The assessments are well-designed (feedback from me from previous years on the structure of questions has been incorporated), and give the students ample opportunity to display research and knowledge. The assessments fully align with the LOs.</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

The student work I examined was of a high quality. These are not law students, but have clearly assimilated well commercial/business related legal principles, and seem clear on what is expected from them (to the credit of the lecturing staff).

I am very impressed with the range of marks used. Generally, the assessments/exams were of high quality (and rewarded as such). Where students, did not perform, however, this was reflected in an appropriately low mark. It is unfortunately common for examiners to 'cluster' marks in a relatively narrow band; I am very pleased to see this was not the case here. Excellent and informative feedback has been provided to students.

### 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

*Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:*

I found the logistical support thorough and effective and was very happy with the materials presented to me, and the standard of marking and assessment. The lecturers are to be highly commended for their dedication, care, and high professional standards.

The admin team at LUBS is excellent, and all documentation was provided in a clear manner. There was an issue with one module, which related in very late delivery of the sample materials. However, both the admin team, and the academic staff, were very clear, and helpful, in their communications, and the matter was easily resolved.

This was my first year to attend the Board in person. It was efficient, and transparent. There was excellent communication in relation to Special Circumstances.

#### Other comments

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

I reiterate that I had not been previously able to attend the PAB in person (due to clashes with my own institutions). I would consider the operation of the PAB to be best practice, and commend the admin team on this.

The academic standards have been consistently excellent, the feedback provided (to me and, more importantly, to students) is excellent.

## Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report

### Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Subject(s):*

BA-HRM / BA-Management and the Human Resource

*Programme(s) / Module(s):*

LUSB2810  
LUBS3915

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

BA

*Title and Name of Responder:*

*Position\*:*

Programme Director

*Faculty / School of:*

Leeds University Business School

*Address for communication:*

*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

#### **Response to Points of innovation and/or good practice**

Thanks for your comments here. The modules are challenging to students as most of them are not law students, but students perform consistently well.

#### **Response to Enhancements made from the previous year**

Thanks for your comments here.

#### **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:*

Thanks for your comments here. I will personally relay your commendations to the module leaders. Efforts will be made to continually refresh the lecture content in order to maintain students' currency with relevant legislation.

## 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:*

Thanks for your comments here – they will be relayed to the teaching staff who acted as assessors on these modules. We strive to use the full range of marks available to us, and will continue to do so.

## 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:*

Thanks for your kind words regarding the admin team at LUBS: I will personally pass on your gratitude. We will all seek to continue to teach and assess at the high standards which you have commended us on achieving.

## Other comments

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

I must express my thanks to you for your work as external examiner. I'm sorry that I was unable to attend the exam board, and look forward to meeting you next year - should our schedules allow.

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

Business

*Subject(s):*

BA-HRM/BA-Management and the Human Resource

*Programme(s) / Module(s):*

LUBS 1760  
 LUBS 288501  
 LUBS 309501  
 LUBS 200001  
 LUBS 2060  
 LUBS 300201  
 LUBS 258001  
 LUBS 300101  
 LUBS 318501  
 LUBS 3311  
 LUBS 385001  
 LUBS 3855  
 LUBS 3095  
 LUBS 1125  
 LUBS 0060

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

BA

**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.*

The programme has a suite of impressive modules which stretch the students and provide opportunities to demonstrate learning at all levels. There is use of a wide variety of assessment modes. Again I have to commend the structures portfolio of LUBS288501 which allows demonstration of real practical research skills and I have not come across a module like this before.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

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

It was good to see increased evidence of marking on exams.

I commend the use of the higher mark ranges which was a suggestion I made last year.

**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?	Y

3.		N
----	--	---

**For Examiners completing their term of appointment**

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	Y
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	Y
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y
7.	Have you acted as an External Examiner Mentor?	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*

Students do well on the modules and marks are generally higher than average in comparison to my own institution, however these marks are justified. There is generally excellent evidence of first and second marking/moderation and quality feedback given to students.

**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.*

Programme aims and ILOs appropriate for UG degree. Structure and content interesting, covering areas of current interest and up to date with recent research

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)*

The dissertations were of a very high standard with interesting, innovative projects. Teaching clearly informed by the research interests of the lecturers involved. I continue to be pleased to see the focus on equality and diversity and industrial relations subjects within the curriculum, which no doubt reflects the particular research interests of staff here.

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

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

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)?	?
-----	--	---

*Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:*



Do not know.

## 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>There is much more consistency in number and type of assessment across equal credit modules. Check this across the programme (still inconsistency between 300201 -3000 word essay; 258001-1500 word essay; 3855-300 word essay etc.)</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 student cohort is very strong here with a much shorter tail of weak marks. This is in direct comparison to my own institution where there are many more fails. The generic marking criteria is tougher than at my present institution. Strong critical ability by many with highly descriptive answers in line with results at other institutions.</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>In relation to marking I found the marking consistent across the samples and the range to be appropriate. I was pleased to see markers using the fuller range of distinction</p> <p>Generally, feedback and evidence of marking was very good and offered students clear rationales for the grades achieved and areas they could improve. There were a couple of modules where at the validation day I have indicated that there needs to be evidence of marking on exams (LUBS3095), more extensive qualitative feedback (LUBS3855).</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?	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
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>Late change of date made attendance at the Board impossible.</p>		

#### Other comments

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

Excellent administration of the validation day. Clear paperwork and ordered samples. Made my job much easier. Excellent support from all staff concerned.

## Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report

### Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

BA-HRM / BA-Management and the Human Resource

Programme(s) / Module(s):

LUBS 1080  
LUBS 1760  
LUBS 288501  
LUBS 309501  
LUBS 200001  
LUBS 2060  
LUBS 300201  
LUBS 258001  
LUBS 300101  
LUBS 318501  
LUBS 3311  
LUBS 385001  
LUBS 3855  
LUBS 3095  
LUBS 1125  
LUBS 0060

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

BA

Title and Name of Responder:

Position\*:

Programme Director

Faculty / School of:

Leeds University Business School

Address for communication:

Maurice Keyworth Building  
University of Leeds  
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

#### Response to Points of innovation and/or good practice

Thanks for your commendation of our degree programmes. I am proud of the student achievements this year, particularly their successes in their dissertations. The LUBS2885 portfolio readies students to undertake critical research and to analyse it effectively.

#### Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

Following your comments last year, your advice was relayed to the teaching team.

#### 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:

Thank you for your positive comments here. We strive to provide timely and detailed feedback to students, with the aim of it 'feeding forward' into future assignments.

## 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:*

Thanks for your positive comments regarding our students' dissertations. They are a very rewarding aspect of the undergraduate teaching experience for students and staff alike. We feel our 'controversies' classes in semester 1, where final year students are exposed to real-life, ongoing HRM/ER research projects being undertaken by LUBS staff, helps students to successfully locate their dissertations.

## 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:*

*"There is much more consistency in number and type of assessment across equal credit modules. Check this across the programme (still inconsistency between 300201 -3000 word essay; 258001-1500 word essay; 3855-300 word essay etc.)"*

Thank you for your comments here. This issue will be raised with the divisional taught student education committee, and efforts will be made to standardise assessment for modules which have similar credit weightings in the same year of study.

*"There were a couple of modules where at the validation day I have indicated that there needs to be evidence of marking on exams (LUBS30951), more extensive qualitative feedback (LUBS3855)"*

Thank you for your comment here. I will personally relay your advice to the relevant module leaders in preparation for next year.

## 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:*

We are sorry for the late change of exam board date. The amendment of the exam board date was primarily guided by the industrial action and the potential impact on student's assessment. The faculty had to be assured that all necessary measures had been taken to ameliorate any impact caused by the industrial action. This meant undertaking a rigorous analysis of all modules and programmes and re-visiting our internal quality assurance processes. Alongside the analysis and review of the potential impact, the faculty felt that a clear split of the assessment board and award and progression board would allow a rigorous reflection of the cohort and individual student marks at each meeting, also affording extra time to act upon any issues that may have arose. This additional measure would add a level of agility to our meetings and secure the same level of robustness to our processes.

## Other comments

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

Thanks for your kind words regarding the administration of validation day. I will pass them on to the staff involved.