

## The University of Leeds

## EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2012– 2013

**Part A: General Information****Subject area and awards being examined**

Faculty / School of:	Modern Language and Cultures
Subject(s):	<i>Thai, SEAsian Studies, Asia-Pacific</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BA

**Completed report**

The completed report should be attached to an e-mail and sent as soon as possible, and no later than six weeks after the relevant meeting of the Board of Examiners, to [exexadmin@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:exexadmin@leeds.ac.uk).

Alternatively you can post your report to: **Head of Academic Quality and Standards**  
Academic Quality and Standards Team  
Room 12:81, EC Stoner Building  
The University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT

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

**Only applicable in first year of appointment**

*Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?*

n/a

**For Examiners completing their term of appointment**

*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*

n/a

## Standards

**1. Please indicate the extent to which the programme Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) were commensurate with the level of the award**

- *The appropriateness of the Intended Learning Outcomes for the programme(s)/modules and of the structure and content of the programme(s);*
- *The extent to which standards are appropriate for the award or award element under consideration.*

The standards conform entirely to the learning outcomes to the extent that I can ascertain.

**2. Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?**

- *The comparability of the programme(s) with similar programme(s) at other institutions and against national benchmarks and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications.*

Comparable in all respects to similar or overlapping programmes at SOAS.

**3. Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs**

- *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.*

The assessment methods seem varied and appropriate.

**4. Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the Aims and ILOs?**

- *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.*

A number of students let down by their writing skills - use of paragraphs, poor unclear English and so-on; many very strong performances too.

**5. For Examiners responsible for programmes that include clinical practice components, please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum**

The presentations assessed for Thai modules were of very high quality; a good opportunity for students to pursue individual interests

**6. Please comment on the nature and effectiveness of enhancements to the programme(s) and modules since the previous year**

*It would be particularly helpful if you could also identify areas of good practice which are worthy of wider dissemination.*

Unaware of significant enhancements (or even changes - enhancements is a rather loaded term!).

**7. Please comment on the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching**

*This may include examples of curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research.*

Question papers reflect the broad research interests of module convenors - while in no way being inappropriately narrow. It's very clear to me how students might see the relevance of their teachers' research to their own study.

## For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements

**8. If you have acted as a mentor to a new External Examiner or have received mentor support please comment here on the arrangements**

n/a

## The Examination/Assessment Process

**9. The University and its Schools provide guidance for External Examiners as to their roles, powers and responsibilities. Please indicate whether this material was sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner.**

- *Whether External Examiners have sufficient access to the material needed to make the required judgements and whether they are encouraged to request additional information.*

Three years in to the role, I'm finding my feet now, thank you.

**10. Did you receive appropriate documentation relating to the programmes and/or parts of programmes for which you have responsibility, e.g. programme specifications or module handbooks, marking criteria?**

- *The coherence of the policies and procedures relating to External Examiners and whether they match the explicit roles they are asked to perform.*

Yes - enough material is provided.

**11. Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments? Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate? If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?**

Yes. Suggested improvements for some essay titles - avoiding yes-no questions and such.

**12. Was sufficient assessed / examined work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work? Were the scripts clearly marked/annotated?**

Yes.

**13. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate? Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?**

Yes.

**14. Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Board of Examiners? Were you able to attend the meeting? Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board?**

Yes.

**15. Were appropriate procedures in place to give due consideration to mitigating circumstances and medical evidence?**

Apparently - though much happens behind closed doors.

## Other comments

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

# School of Modern Languages and Cultures

FACULTY OF ARTS



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

---

22 October 2013

Dear

Response to External Examiner's Report, 2012-2013

Many thanks for your Examiner's Report for the academic year 2012-2013. I am delighted that you seem, on the whole, pleased with what we are achieving in Thai/APS/SEAS at Leeds.

I note your comment about the poor writing skills (Q.4) of some students – a problem not restricted, of course, just to the Thai/APS/SEAS section, but something we will continue to address this year through feedback and skills workshops. In response to your comment about mitigating circumstances decisions (Q.15), I will ask that the School provides a clearer statement about the pre-Exam Board process, at the very least to allow greater transparency for external examiners.

It only remains for me to thank you, on behalf of all colleagues in East Asian Studies, for your continued input as external. We have benefitted in particular from you very thoughtful and constructive comments at exam boards, and we look forward to working with you again over the coming year.

With very best wishes,

School of Modern Languages and Cultures  
University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT