

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18 QAT Received 23/07/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Leeds University Business School

Subject(s):

International Business

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Various modules of international business nature, constituting the BSc International Business degree programme.

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

BSc International Business

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.

As pointed out last year, provision of failed exam feedback is highly commendable. Providing brief comments for high marks is also a good practice applied by some. I have noticed that this was widely practised across the modules.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

As pointed out above, the recommendation to provide feedback on both good and poor exam and assignment performance was taken on board across all the modules that I reviewed.

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
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses to these?	Y
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
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

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.

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)

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.

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:

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?	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

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

While I attended the Validation Day on the 20th June 2018, however, I was not able to attend the Progression and Awards Board (which was held on the 26th June 2018) as there was a short notice to the change of dates. I hope in future both processes could be brought together so that external examiners can do one trip. However, based on the work that I examined throughout the academic year, I have confidence that the deliberations of the Progression and Awards Board were appropriate.

Other comments

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

Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

International Business

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Various modules of international business nature, constituting the BSc International Business degree programme.

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

BSc International Business

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Head of School

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

We note the positive comments in relation to our approach to feedback. Both the programme and the wider division have a strong commitment to providing effective feedback to our students. As a Division, we have a feedback strategy that incorporates areas of best practice in relation to feedback. The commendation received here forms a part of that.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

We also note further comments in relation to our feedback standards. Our feedback strategy is reviewed annually, to ensure that we maintain the very highest standards and can incorporate any new or innovative approaches as appropriate.

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:

We note that there are no matters that require our urgent attention.

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 note the responses provided to questions 1-7 and are satisfied that no further action is required.

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:

We note the responses provided to questions 8-16 and are satisfied that no further action is required.

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:

We note the responses provided to questions 17-19 and are satisfied that no further action is required.

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 note the responses provided to questions 20-35 and support the notion that the validation day and progression and awards process can be more efficient in future years.

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

N/A