

POTCHEFSTROOM BUSINESS SCHOOL: EXTERNAL MODERATOR'S REPORT

1.1.1 MODULE TITLE	Leadership
MODULE CODE	MBAD 821 - 2020
EXTERNAL MODERATOR	Prof R Steyn

A. SYLLABUS

1. Is the syllabus adequately and appropriately covered by the learning content?

<u>YES</u>	NO
------------	----

If 'No', why not? _____

2. Does the syllabus (by means of outcomes) address the required management skills?

<u>YES</u>	NO
------------	----

If 'No', why not? _____

3. Is the required learning content adequately addressed by the prescribed book w.r.t.:

- Conceptual approach?
- Examples?
- Exercises?

<u>YES</u>	NO
<u>YES</u>	NO
YES	<u>NO</u>

If 'No', why not? The focus is on article, and these number of articles may be too extensive for the average student to read. Also, articles rarely provide exercise, which may make the reading material insufficient. I trust that this will be addressed in class, but it is not addressed in the "prescribed book"

B. EXAMINATION PAPER

1. Were the module outcomes adequately evaluated by the:

- topics covered in the paper (specific outcomes)?
- type of questions set (critical outcomes)?

<u>YES</u>	NO
<u>YES</u>	NO

If '**No**', why not? I marked yes, and not no. The outcomes was partially addressed. The comprehensive and systematic knowledge base was addressed well, while communication and engagement with people at micro, meso and macro organisational levels and in a multi-cultural environment was addressed partially. As per the outcomes, the research report was not addressed, but it could hardly be expected that this will be addressed in an examination of this sort. I suppose this was covered in assignments.

2. Did the paper, as a whole, cover the syllabus adequately?

YES	<u>NO</u>
-----	-----------

If '**No**', why not? As stated above, some aspects of the syllabus is beyond the examination. However. Essential elements which is assessable by means of an exam paper were assessed.

3. Were marks allocated on a fair basis as to the importance of the specific topic and time allowed?

YES	NO
-----	----

If '**No**', why not? _____

4. Was the standard of the questions:

- In accordance with expected outcomes?
- Well formulated with measurable action words?
- Of acceptable international standard?

<u>YES</u>	NO
YES	<u>NO</u>
<u>YES</u>	NO

If '**No**', why not? The paper could be clearer on how the marks would be allocated. Within questions per section allocation of marks could be useful. Also, the format of the expected answer could be clarified to the students.

5. Did the assignments (standard and frequency) comply with the outcomes and contribute (add value) to the overall achievement of the outcomes?

YES

NO

If 'No', any recommendation? _____

C. MARKING

1. Were marks awarded:

- consistently?
- according to the marks memorandum?
- for acceptable alternative answers in open-ended questions?

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO

If 'No', why not? _____

2. Was the marking of an acceptable standard?

YES

NO

If 'No', any recommendation? Mark allocation in general seems a bit generous, but it was done consistently.

GENERAL

Any remarks not covered by the above?

I think that the paper covers knowledge on the topic well, but could be improved focusing on evaluation of the workplace, as well as critical analyses, though question on contrasting or the materialization of ideals in practice.