

# The University of Leeds

## EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2013– 2014

### Part A: General Information

#### Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	Languages, Cultures and Societies
Subject(s):	
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MODL5000M, MODL5001M, MODL5003M, MODL5005M, MODL5018M, MODL5301M
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MA

#### Name and home Institution / affiliation of Examiner

#### 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 Quality Assurance**  
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*

N/A

#### **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*

I appreciated that the <> Thomas has always been highly efficient in passing on my comments to relevant staff members and any suggestions I made were given due attention. It was refreshing to see that the teaching staff are reflective of their own practices and open to new ideas and suggestions for improvements. This made the already well-structured, comprehensive programme dynamic and robust. The staff change at one point was well managed and the transition was very smooth without any negative impact.

## 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.*

I am satisfied that the programme aims and ILOs are well aligned and appropriate both at the programme and the module level. There is no concern regarding appropriateness of the standards in relation to the given award.

**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.*

Yes, in terms of such expectations and the benchmark with which I am familiar in Ireland as well as in the UK.

**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 were appropriate in relation to the ILOs. One question I had was if it might be useful to do a review on less popular optional assessment topics in determining the following year's options. Appropriate second marking arrangements were in place to ensure that the students would receive fair and consistent feedback. Comments that the new feedback sheet for a particular module was too detailed to be practical have been addressed by the module leader in charge. The students' achievements demonstrated the extent of effectiveness of teaching and commitment by the staff.

**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.*

Yes. In my opinion the students were given appropriate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement through fair, relevant assessment.

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

N/A

**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.*

The programme maintains high standards and technology components are comprehensive and kept up-to-date as well as being relevant to today's translation workplace and research contexts. This is credit to the staff members concerned for updating their skills in a fast changing technological environment.

**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.*

As noted above, teaching and the curriculum are well-informed by the current research, indicating the staff are actively engaged in research relevant to their areas of teaching.

**8. Where the programme forms part of an Integrated PhD, please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD**

N/A

## For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements

9. 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

10. 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.*

Yes.

11. 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.

12. 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. Some comments were made and which were considered and incorporated where appropriate.

13. 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 to both questions.

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

Yes to both questions.

15. 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?

Unfortunately I was unable to attend the meeting.

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

Yes (based on a subsequent communication).

## Other comments

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

I have enjoyed the experience and learned a lot during my term as an external examiner. Professional attitudes by staff members also made my role not only enjoyable but also very smooth running. On a practical level the great care taken to logically organise (otherwise potentially confusing) anonymised rows of marks on the Excel spreadsheet was greatly appreciated. The modules are well designed and taught to equip the students well according to the learning outcomes. The

successful accreditation with the EMT network was an endorsement of such a well-conceived and delivered programme. Congratulations are due to <> and all concerned.

I would like to express my particular gratitude to the director <> for handling extern communication professionally and running board meetings efficiently yet in a personable and amicable manner with a touch of humour, which made sometimes long sittings much less stressful. Similarly, I much appreciated the great assistance given by <>.

# School of Languages, Cultures and Societies

FACULTY OF ARTS



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

25 Feb 2015

Dear

Many thanks for your report on our postgraduate programme in Applied Translation Studies and associated core and optional modules for 2013-14.

I am delighted to read that you find evidence for the effectiveness of our teaching in the achievements of our students and that assessment is fair and relevant.

I am also pleased that you have found team members to be reflective and open to new ideas for improvements, and that we have managed changes in staffing smoothly. We will take on board your suggestion that we might review less popular optional assessment topics in informing those offered in subsequent years.

Ensuring that the technology used in our teaching maintains pace of change with that used in industry is essential, though not without its challenges. This, together with our commitment to keeping track of, and contributing to, the current research agenda enables us to ensure the relevance of our provision. As you suggest, the accreditation for the programme within the EMT network, achieved very largely thanks to the efforts of Dr Ciobanu, reflects the quality of the programme and its international standing.

I am delighted that you have enjoyed your time as external examiner. We have certainly enjoyed working with you and I have passed on your comments to colleagues, as is only appropriate.

I wish you all the best for a productive and satisfying sabbatical and we look forward to working with you on new projects in future.

With kind regards,

Exams Tutor, Translation Studies

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**  
**ACADEMIC YEAR: 2013– 2014**

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

Faculty / School of:	Languages, Cultures and Societies
Subject(s):	Spanish/English and English/Spanish Translation
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MODL5302M MODL5119M MODL5129M
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MA

**Name and home Institution / affiliation of Examiner****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 Quality Assurance**  
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*

n/a

**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?*

**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*

## 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 Aims and ILO are very appropriate for the modules and standards are also appropriate.
  
- 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.*

The modules compares with to those provided by similar institutions.
  
- 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.*

Appropriate assessment methods are used, reflecting a realistic level of difficulty, student performance keeps reflecting good teaching practice.
  
- 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.*

Students produce good quality work at MA level and their performance is comparable and on occasion superior to that of students on similar courses across the country.
  
- 5. For Examiners responsible for programmes that include clinical practice components, please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum**

n/a
  
- 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.*

There have been no significant changes.
  
- 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.*

There is evidence that teaching is informed by up to date research.
  
- 8. Where the programme forms part of an Integrated PhD, please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD**

**For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements**

9. 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**

10. 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.*

Yes

11. 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

12. 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?

No draft papers/assessments were submitted but the nature and level of questions was consistently appropriate.

13. 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, I felt confident evaluating the standard of student work. I have mentioned to markers and programme leaders that handwritten comments are not always very legible.

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

Yes, I enjoyed reading the dissertations and thought the marks had been carefully considered.

15. 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.

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

Yes.

**Other comments**

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



# The University of Leeds

## EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2013– 2014

### Part A: General Information

#### Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	School of Languages, Cultures and Societies
Subject(s):	Language Centre
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Academic English for Postgraduate Studies
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	

#### Name and home Institution / affiliation of Examiner

#### 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 Quality Assurance**  
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*

There were no areas requiring urgent attention

#### **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 ILOs cover the skills normally expected for a pre-sessional course of this type.
- ILOs are clearly delineated and appropriately challenging.
- Students are exposed to a wide range of academic genres via authentic texts, and there are ample opportunities for students to engage with them via the four skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking.
- Tasks have been designed to integrate skills and to give students opportunities to develop both the cognitive and communication skills they are likely to require for their intended programmes of study.
- The programme is well staged and paced; this is particularly evident in the sequence of three projects, which require learners to engage with progressively more challenging tasks as they move through the programme.

### 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.*

- The programme is comparable to similar pre-sessional programmes, both in terms of content, methodology and level of challenge.

### 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 are well-aligned with the programme ILOs. Assessment tasks, like the programme itself, require students to demonstrate an ability to integrate skills to complete authentic academic tasks. All four skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) are covered.
- Descriptors for student output are clearly delineated and comprehensive allowing for balanced evaluation of the quality of content, communicative competence, and the range and accuracy of language.
- There are appropriate arrangements in place for benchmarking, standardisation and double marking.
- The quality of the papers examined show that the students had a clear understanding of the task and were adequately prepared via take-in tasks and mock tests to make a reasonable attempt to demonstrate their learning.

### 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.*

- There were adequate opportunities for students to demonstrate learning via a range of assessment tasks.
- The quality of work examined is comparable to students on pre-sessional courses of this type.
- The descriptors appear to have been consistently applied. Feedback is clear and detailed.
- Based on the sample of work examined and the descriptors provided, the threshold of 55 for a pass appears to be equivalent to 6.5 IELTS (the level most frequently required for entry to academic programmes). However, the table showing equivalences between IELTS and English Language Exit Statements appears to be skewed further up the scale and is potentially misleading if this is used to compare the performance of high achieving students on the course and those entering directly with an IELTS score of 7.0 or above.
- Students showed strengths in their ability to integrate skills, particularly reading and writing (evident in the three Academic Projects), and listening and writing (evident in the lecture listening and summary writing assessment).
- There were no salient weaknesses in the cohort examined.

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

N/A

**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.*

- The aims of the course are more clearly delineated for both students and teachers.
- The marking descriptors have been elaborated so that differences in performance equivalent to 0.5 IELTS bands can be distinguished.
- All four skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking are clearly integrated, both in the course and in the methods of assessment. Marks for assessments that integrate skills are presented as such.
- Guidance to teachers is detailed and thorough. Two-week teachers' induction is indicative of a strong commitment to quality of delivery.

**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.*

- The ILOs are informed by BALEAR competency statements.
- The focus of the course is squarely on the achievement of academic tasks associated with research as a vehicle for the development of academic English language skills.

**8. Where the programme forms part of an Integrated PhD, please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD**

N/A

**For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements**

**9. 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**

**10. 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.*

Yes, access was sufficient

**11. 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

**12. 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?**

N/A

**13. 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, though in future it would be helpful to have recordings of a sample of student presentations along with the feedback

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

N/A

**15. 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?**

N/A

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

N/A

**Other comments**

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