

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**  
**ACADEMIC YEAR: 2014– 2015**

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

Faculty / School of:	Education
Subject(s):	BA English, Language and Education
Programme(s) / Module(s):	EDUC2080, EDUC 3000, EDUC 3009, EDUC3030
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BA

**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*

None noted.

**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**

- 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 seem appropriate for the level the course is aimed at. No changes suggested.

**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.*

I would say that the ILOs of this programme are comparable to those of other BA degrees of this nature.

**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.*

I was impressed by the range and variety of assessment types and procedures. It is clear that the course tutors are using an appropriate and varied approach to assessment and making use of many types of task to reflect the diversity of the modules on offer.

**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.*

The overall standards in the sample I saw are high and demonstrate a sound understanding of key concepts. I was especially struck by students' ability to link theory to practice and to draw on both published research and experiential knowledge in their writing. Some of the weaker responses failed to engage adequately with the tasks set and/or made poor use of the literature. The overall marks were high, but I felt appropriate and accurately reflected the abilities of this cohort of students.

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

Not applicable.

**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.*

N/A, this is a relatively new programme.

**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.*

I felt that all the four modules I examined were research led and made extensive use of current literature and recent research studies. It was pleasing too to note that some of the tutors' own work is being used in the modules, a real strength and to observe that research methodologies used (for example in the final year project) are both current and appropriate to the type of action research being undertaken here. I would say that this degree is located very clearly in an appropriate research area and guided by current debates.

**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**

I am acting as mentor but to date, nothing to report.

## 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.*

I found all the materials which were available to be entirely appropriate, easy to use and transparent. No changes recommended here.

**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.

**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, all scripts were clearly marked and demonstrated a useful spread of marks. Feedback from tutors to students is exemplary and students clearly receive excellent feedback which is both formative and summative.

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

Yes, all the final year projects seemed appropriate in terms of both level and content.

**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, all very satisfactory.

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

There were none noted, but I believe these procedures are in place and are used where necessary.

## Other comments

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

I thoroughly enjoyed meeting the course team and the students, which was a really invaluable aspect of the QA procedure. I believe that this will become an extremely successful degree and would like to congratulate the team for the very high quality of their work and for the time and trouble taken in relation to student guidance and support and to assessment practices more generally. Feedback from the students was excellent and no real concerns were expressed, apart from the timing of some aspects of the degree. It is obvious to me, from conversations with students and from reading their work, that anyone taking this degree is very well-supported and experiences high quality teaching and support for learning.

20 October 2015

<<>>

Dear <<>>

Many thanks for your very positive and supportive report on the BA English, Language and Education and English, Language and Business Enterprise programmes. Your comments and insights will continue to inform the design of the programmes and our practice.

In particular, we were delighted with your praise of a number of elements of the programmes: the range and variety of assessments and procedures; the high standards of students' work and their ability to link theory to practice; our research-led teaching, and especially the use of tutors' own research; the quality of formative and summative feedback; and the high quality of student guidance and support for learning, which we consider a particular strength of our provision here at Leeds. Your comments have provided great encouragement for the future of both programmes as they recruit increasing numbers of students and become more established.

Although you do not yourself identify any particular areas in need of attention, we are grateful to you for noting that there is some student dissatisfaction with the timing of, support for, and feedback on assessments. As we review and update modules we will be paying more attention to staggered assessment, so that students have feedback on their progress during the semester rather than after the module has been completed. Similarly, clear assignment advice and support is being structured into the modules as we review them, so that students are always aware of how the module sessions relate to the assignments.

As regards feedback, the Language Education team operates a policy of giving feedback on assignment plans or drafts up to three weeks before the submission date. It is not clear whether this policy operates evenly across the School of Education, and if there is inconsistency this may be a reason for student dissatisfaction with levels and timeliness of feedback. We will be initiating discussion at School level regarding the consistent implementation of this policy. More broadly, the team are fully aware of the importance of

giving regular feedback, and of clearly signposting this (when informal) so that it is recognised as such.

Finally, we are extremely grateful for the time and consideration you have given to your report, and to your very positive contribution as external examiner. This is very much appreciated by the students, the Student Education Office, and the academic team.

With warmest thanks and best wishes

<<>>

Head of School of Education