

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:

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.

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 action

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
<p><i>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</i></p> <p>Overall the modules I have examined fit into a coherent and contemporary programme of Criminology & Criminal Justice. They provide a range of core and optional modules for Criminology and Law students that engage with key issues in the study of crime, offending and contemporary criminal justice. Collectively the modules provide an interesting and stimulating curriculum with a very good breadth and depth of engagement with a variety of theoretical, socio-legal or critical criminal justice practice or policy related material. The learning outcomes for modules are clear and the programme aligns with the national Criminology subject benchmarks.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<p><i>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)</i></p> <p>The research of staff is clearly evident in the teaching and learning curriculum - the modules or themes/approaches within modules reflect the specialism and expertise of the staff. 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.</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>		

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 sometimes the former that could be expanded). There is a good variety of assessments, newer modules have used more varied strategies and across the programme this means that a more varied strategies are employed and students have the opportunity to develop different skills in for example, policy reports, poster presentations, short tasks as well as more standard research essay and examinations. Sometimes a wider range of essay titles could allow students to explore their own interests particularly at level 6 and enhance their sense of choice.

There has been a move to step marking on all of the written assessments and this has been employed across the modules this year.

From what I have observed in assessment processes, feedback and moderation 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, as in previous years there was a strong cohort performance 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

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

I attended the examination board and observed the proceedings, the Board was carried out rigorously and candidates were dealt with fairly and in accordance with the University regulations.

I was able to observe most of the modules through the VLE site - the module leaders often highlight on excel spread sheets the sample they would like me to consider - this can be quite cumbersome when there are modules with a very large number of students to cross reference the same students across multiple pieces of assessment by their student number. As the VLE is very flexible and shows all the grades it would be simpler from the EE's position to select a sample myself that incorporates an appropriate range of grades at all levels and enables me to make a full assessment of the marking in my role.

Some minor issues with my access to VLE but this were quickly rectified and dealt with by the administration staff who were very helpful and quick in helping resolve this.

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):

Criminology and Criminal Justice

Programme(s) / Module(s):

BA – Criminology and Criminal Justice, Criminology and Criminal Justice International

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

BA

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Director of Student Education

Faculty / School of:

FFS/Law

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

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 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

You make a number of more specific points under separate heads and these will be dealt with individually, nevertheless I would like to thank you for your helpful and positive comments.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

Given the considerable changes that might occur as a result of the new Solicitors Qualifying Examination major enhancements across all programmes have been somewhat on hold. We are currently undertaking a major review of our LLB and its fitness for purpose, and it will be appropriate to consider the BA alongside this though no major changes will be envisaged. In addition we are carrying out a comprehensive consideration of the assessment portfolio at both undergraduate and postgraduate level. The aim of this is to ensure a programme approach to assessment thereby diversifying and reducing assessment loads. Again, we will keep you updated as to our progress and indeed may seek your advice at some point.

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:

Many thanks for your very positive comments relating to the standards on the programme. It is very pleasing to note your recognition of the 'interesting and stimulating curriculum' and its depth. It is also very pleasing to note

your recognition of clear learning outcomes. As mentioned previously we have recently undergone a process of ensuring compatibility between these and assessment methods. I am further pleased that you recognised the quality of the work in student dissertations. The dissertation is the capstone of a Leeds degree and preparing students for this substantial task appears to be working well.

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 have attempted in recent years to ensure feedback is varied across modules thereby allowing all students to make the most of their skills. Whilst this is a very positive step we are also mindful of over assessment and are currently reviewing the full assessment diet to ensure its fitness for purpose from a programme perspective.

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 again for your attendance at the board. Though there is often little to discuss your advice is always valued and helps us to determine those rare but difficult questions. It is important that our processes are tested and as an External Examiner you are a valuable critical friend.

Other comments

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

In relation to the VLE I do understand that it can be cumbersome. I will check the advice individual members of staff are giving to the external examiner when sending work. The point of highlighting various scripts for consideration is to try to provide an appropriate sample for the examiner to consider, though of course any work can be looked at. Your comments suggest that we haven't quite got this right so we will consider it further at our next Quality Assurance meeting.