

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

Part A: General Information**Subject area and awards being examined***Title and Name of Examiner:**Faculty / School of:*

LUBS

Subject(s):

HRM

Programme(s) / Module(s):

LUBS 2580; LUBS 2095; LUBS 3311; LUBS 2000; LUBS 2060; LUBS 3001; LUBS 3185; LUBS 3855; LUBS 3002; LUBS 2885.

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

BA-HRM/BA-Management and the Human Resource

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.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.
 I commend the use of the higher mark ranges which was a suggestion I made last year and which has been acted on this year. I am also pleased to see increased consistency across the programme in terms of number of assessment points and length of assignments.

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 only

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 an External Examiner Mentor?	N

For Examiners completing their term of appointment only

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>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</p> <p>Programme aims and ILOs appropriate for UG degree. Structure and content interesting, covering areas of current interest and up to date with recent research. Students do well on the modules and marks are generally higher than average in comparison to my own institution, however these marks are justified.</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>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 continued focus on equality and diversity and industrial relations subjects within the curriculum, which no doubt reflects the particular research interests of staff here.</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>		
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>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y / N
<p>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</p> <p>Do not know.</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>As commented above, there is now much more consistency in number and type of assessment across equal credit modules. Creative, interesting assessment modes. Good evidence of internal moderation of marks.</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 marks.</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 I have indicated that there needs to be evidence of marking on exams (LUBS30951), more extensive qualitative feedback (LUBS 2000), and clear evidence of second marking (LUBS 2095; 3001).</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?	Mostly
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>Appreciated that modules were labelled with the marks allowing easier moderation.</p> <p>I do miss the validation day and found that there was a lot of pressure to get a large number of moderations back in a short space of time.</p> <p>Very efficient administration overall.</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 Examiner:

Subject(s):	HRM
Programme(s) / Module(s):	LUBS 2580; LUBS 2095; LUBS 3311; LUBS 2000; LUBS 2060; LUBS 3001; LUBS 3185; LUBS 3855; LUBS 3002; LUBS 2885.
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BA HRM / BA Management and the Human Resource
Title and Name of Responder:	
Position*:	Programme Director BA HRM/BA Business Management and the Human Resource
Faculty / School of:	LUBS/WERD
Address for communication:	LUBS Maurice Keyworth Building
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) must be sent 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

Firstly I would like to thank _____ for a very helpful and complementary report. Very pleased that _____ has identified with key aspects of the courses with which _____ expresses satisfaction – specifically the range of modules and assessment modes and the opportunities provided for learning. The Programme Team continue to work to provide a very high quality of student experience and we believe that the range of modules, the stretch that these provide in terms of student learning do have a significant impact on student outcomes. The comments later about the quality of dissertations bears this out and helps to account for the numbers of students in this cohort (10) who graduated with first class honours degrees.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

Again the comments here are positive. The advice in the previous year to use the higher mark ranges has been taken on by the teaching teams, with clear results in some modules. The concern to ensure consistency in the number of assessment points and lengths of assessments has also been listened to and brought changes that have been welcomed by staff and students. I am assuming the point here (as in the response to question 17) is in having assessments that are of an appropriate length for their weighting and/or module credit?

It is never straightforward on courses where a number of modules cut across divisions to ensure a high level of consistency in assessment timing. The same also applies to the length of assessments but it is a testament to the work on overseeing modules at a Divisional and LUBS level that this is now working in a way that is fairer to students and seems to be appreciated by them.

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:

None noted

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:

There may be an issue relating to providing External Examiner mentoring. I am not aware of the process here and it may well be that as an experienced academic with wide external examiner expertise it was felt that this was not 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:

The comments here are overwhelmingly positive and welcomed. The general sense from the feedback is that standards are appropriate, the learning outcomes and structure are those that would be expected on courses of this kind, and that the quality of student work is high. Particular mention is made of the currency of the programme and the modules and teaching research-informed. The dissertation is also identified as an area where particularly high quality and innovative work was evidenced.

The programmes benefit considerably from a committed group of research-active staff who are engaged in issues of current concern in the worlds of work, employment and HRM. These clearly come through in terms of the module content and the student performance, especially some of the final year modules of which the dissertation is the one singled out as particularly noteworthy.

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 feedback here emphasises greater consistency in assessment across equally weighted module (17) and the assessment methods and design are appropriate to the course (18). The comments on the quality of the cohort, their level of critical ability together with the rigour of the marking criteria used (19) are also to be welcomed and reflect the work that has been undertaken by the Programme Teams.

Other points on Q.19 point to a need to be clearer in some modules on evidence of marking and of more detailed feedback, which we will address. Nonetheless the points more generally on feedback and evidence of feedback reflect the work that the Division has made in these areas (feedback and feed forward in particular) and which are now beginning to be reflected in NSS scores in this area at level 3.

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:

Other than Q.29 which was alluded to in Q.19 there appears to be a general satisfaction with the way the course functions, standards and the processes surrounding these. Again the efficiency of the administrative processes is highlighted and is obviously good to see.

The last academic session 201819 was the first year where LUBS SES Assessment did not operate a validation day for external examiners at both Undergraduate and Postgraduate levels. This decision was reached by considering a number of factors that are directly related to the preparation of the progression and awards boards.

Taking into consideration the numerous process involved in facilitating the boards, it was identified that a more streamlined approach was required to help the assessment team manage the volume of samples. With some modules moving to more variant methods of assessment including video and embedded links to online platforms, it was agreed that a consistent approach to distribution was required in order to manage them effectively.

Utilising the technology that the team have at their disposal to quickly distribute samples allows extra time which can be spent processing the large volume of marks and the associated quality assurance checks in anticipation of the board meetings. The annual increases in the volume of modules and student numbers mean that more creative and efficient ways of managing the schedule is required to meet the institutions fixed deadlines of returning marks.

Other comments

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

None made.

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

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

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 process is fair and transparent, and students appear well aware of what is expected of them. Very good feedback is provided, on both exams and CAs.

The method of assessments in the modules are appropriate, and the standards are certainly in line with comparable institutions. The mode of assessments (particularly the case studies) is very good, and allows students the opportunity to display, and be rewarded for, hard work.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

I have been consistently impressed with the processes in the modules I examine; they are appropriate, and well-tailored, to the programmes.

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 only

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 only

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.

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.

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.

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)

It is clear that the students are lectured in accordance with very up-to-date materials (case law and legislation). I find the case study and exam questions always have a focus on current events. Problem-based learning is central to the modules.

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:

(although how 'clinical' is defined is important; the students are asked many questions on how to advise fictional clients- this could be considered 'clinical' in the legal sense)

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:
NOTE: I am not familiar with requirements for Business programmes.

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>The assessments are very well-designed, and give the students ample opportunity to display research and knowledge. The constant use of case studies is exemplary, and the scenarios are very well-constructed. 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
<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 work I examined was of a high quality. There is a particular challenge in teaching these modules to students, for whom law is not the primary focus of the degree. The work I saw showed that the students 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).</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>Generally, the assessments/exams were of high quality (and rewarded as such). I have commended the markers before on their willingness to use a range of marks (and not just 'cluster' marks in a relatively narrow band). I did wonder, however, if more use could have been used of the 25-40 range. Whilst nobody wants to see students failing, some of the weaker answers might have warranted a lower mark (but, as indicated to the Board, the marks actually awarded fall well within what I would consider appropriate- I, personally, might have been a little harsher on occasion...).</p> <p>I have commented before on the excellent and informative feedback provided to students; if anything this is worthy of extra praise this year.</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

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. It is very time consuming to provide the level, and quality, of feedback the students received, and the lecturers should receive appropriate credit for this.

The admin team at LUBS is excellent, and all documentation was provided in a clear manner. Unfortunately, due to illness, I could not attend the PAB.

Other comments

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

I reiterate that I consider the admin support for external examiners to be excellent (especially given the very tight time-frames under which the team operates).

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

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):	Business Law and Employment Law
Programme(s) / Module(s):	LUBS2810 LUBS3915
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BA Human Resource Management/BA Management and the Human Resource

<i>Title and Name of Responder:</i>	
<i>Position*:</i>	Programme Director BA HRM + BA Business Management and the Human Resource*
<i>Faculty / School of:</i>	LUBS/WERS
<i>Address for communication:</i>	
<i>Email:</i>	
<i>Telephone:</i>	

**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) must be sent 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

Very pleased with the overwhelmingly positive comments made here. Particularly gratified to see comments relating to feedback which has been an issue for the course in previous years and where there is clear evidence (NSS) that we are addressing this and with positive results.

The mode of assessments is also viewed positively with particular reference made to the use of case studies for assessment purposes. This may provide a basis for a wider discussion of their use across other modules within the course.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

I would just like to endorse the comments made in this section on processes being well-tailored to the programme. I am assuming here that this relates to clarity of communications with students, timeliness of assessments and the timing, appropriateness and quality of feedback provided to students. Again, and to re-iterate the point above, the area of feedback in particular is one where the Division and Programme Team has made considerable progress in the last year.

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:

No comments recorded.

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:

There are no comments recorded here and - it appears – this section was not addressed by the external examiner.

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:

The comments in these sections indicate a high level of satisfaction with the modules and their academic standards. does make the point that knowledge of the wider programmes of which these two modules form a part may be limited and that feedback needs to be viewed in the context of a subject specialist commenting on module rather than programme standards. Notwithstanding these points, the view expressed is that the law modules do fit well with the programmes in which they sit, and that the modules themselves benefit from up-to-date materials and from an emphasis on problem-based learning.

Overall, we appreciate the external's feedback and his recognition of the quality of the modules, the appropriateness of the learning outcomes, the assessments and the quality of feedback. All areas that have been worked on in recent years.

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:

Again we would thank the external for overwhelmingly positive reflections on the modules and the student performance. The points about well-designed assessments, the exemplary use of case studies (17) and well-designed scenarios are all valuable feedback and appreciated. It is also particularly heartening to see feedback on how well our non-law students appear to cope with law modules (19).

There is a point made about using the full range of marks and whether a certain range (25-40) could have been used more and a note about marks tending to cluster around a relatively narrow band. This is a wider issue of a 'work-in-progress' around using a fuller range of marks than has perhaps been customary in HE and is being addressed in other modules within the Division. It is certainly an area where work needs to continue to take place in the forthcoming year.

Finally a point is made about the 'informative and excellent feedback provided to students' (19), adding that this is 'worthy of extra praise this year'. Again this reflects ongoing work within the Division with feedback and indeed 'feed forward'. Evidence from the most recent NSS results, that the work in this area is paying dividends with significant improvement in the scores in this area over the last two years.

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:

Again there is considerable overall satisfaction with the progression and awards process with the LUBS Administration team singled out for particular praise. The lecturing team are also highlighted in terms of their dedication, care and high professional standards. He adds that 'It is very time consuming to provide the level, and quality, of feedback the students received' (35) and that lecturers should receive credit for this.

Overall the feedback demonstrates a high level of satisfaction with all aspects of the module – learning outcomes, delivery, assessments, feedback and administrative support. Indeed some areas, such as the use of case studies, feedback and the general high level of academic standards maintained by the teaching team are given particular mention and commended. I would just like to thank the external for these very supportive comments and the recognition of the work that has been and continues to be undertaken by a dedicated group of academics.

Other comments

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

Just to say again that we welcome the very positive comments here relating to the admin team, the lecturing team and the references to the feedback provided and high academic standards of the modules.

This may be an issue to pursue internally in terms of examples of 'best practice' that we might want to examine more closely and share with colleagues in the Division.