

16 October 2017

Dear

External Examiner's Report for 2016-17

I am writing to thank you for your work over the last year as External Examiner for our suite of Foundation Degrees and Honours degrees in Learning and Teaching. I know that members of the programme team are very appreciative of your observations on our work from an external perspective, especially your care in giving such thorough and detailed feedback on individual modules and assignments.

This year, the University has added further sections to the External Examiner's form to provide you with a structured response to your report from our programme team. Please find this completed form enclosed so that you can see the thoughts and plans that arise from our consideration of your comments.

With all good wishes,

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016 – 2017

Name and home Institution / affiliation of Examiner

Title and Name of Examiner:

Institution:

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

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 Progression and Awards Board, to gat@leeds.ac.uk. **All reports should be submitted in Word format to allow the responses to be appended.**

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

Guidance to the External Examiner:

This standard report form is in several parts.

Part A summarises information about the programmes being examined. **Where individual modules are listed it is important to link these with a specific programme and award.**

Part B asks some specific questions and provides space for more detailed comments from Examiners. This External Examiner's Report is designed to ensure the university is in line with sector standards; however it is also used to support further enhancement of student education across the institution. It is therefore essential that where External Examiners have presented oral or written reports to the Assessment Board, salient details are reiterated within this annual report

Examiners may, if they wish, structure their report(s) in a different way; however, please address the matters identified in the prompts.

Examiners in the final year of their appointment are asked to give an overview in the box provided of their opinion on the programme over their full period of acting as external examiner, commenting in particular on aspects of development and enhancement.

The report will be considered by the School and the relevant Faculty Taught Student Education Board. It will also be made available to students, with appropriate redactions applied.

Part C provides a formal response to the External Examiner's Report.

Data Protection Act 1998

*Comments in any part of the form relating to a named or identifiable student will become available to that student should (s)he submit a data subject access request under the Data Protection Act 1998. **External Examiners are accordingly asked not to identify individual students in their reports. Examiners are also advised not to identify individual members of staff by name.***

If, in addition to this report, you wish to send a confidential note to the Vice-Chancellor on any matter, please feel free to do so.

April 2017

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	Lifelong Learning Centre
Subject(s):	Learning and Teaching
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Foundation Degree Learning and Teaching BA Learning and Teaching Foundation Degree Learning and Teaching (Special Educational Needs and Disability) BA Learning and Teaching (Special Educational Needs and Disability)
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	FdA and BA

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.

Tutor comments on assignments are very detailed, constructive and supportive of the development of the students, both as academic writers and reflective practitioners.

Student work across levels of achievement shows commendable positive engagement in workplace settings and with work-related issues, which is a positive feature of the courses.

The varied assessment diet provides opportunities for students to develop skills for future employment, and also to utilise their existing skills from employment.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.

I received examples across the full range of marks, including fails, and the team has provided additional evidence of effective moderation processes. This has been extremely helpful.

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.

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiners Handbook?	N/A
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?	N/A
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	N/A

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	N/A
----	---	-----

5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	N/A
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	N/A
7.	Have you acted as a External Examiner Mentor?	N/A

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

Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.

The courses are well-structured and there is a very good sense of the development of students' knowledge and skills as they progress through the courses, including from the FdA to BA. There is a varied assessment diet, which enables students to develop and evidence a range of skills. The courses are designed well to relate to practical experience and to support the development of reflective practice and engagement with appropriate theory.

There is a varied assessment diet, with a range of assignments to help the students to develop skills in written, verbal and visual presentation formats. This is particularly positive given the diverse backgrounds and experience of the student population, and the development of their skills for current and future employability.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
-----	---	---

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)

The process of supporting the students in the development of their dissertations, and of developing their plans into reality is effective and well-structured. There is a good sense that this significant piece of work draws upon skills developed throughout the students' studies.

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
-----	--	---

Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
-----	--	---

Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:

16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
-----	--	---

Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<p><i>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.</i></p> <p>There is an appropriate match between intended learning outcomes and assessment items. It is very clear that the students receive an effective level of support from members of academic staff, including through detailed, constructive and developmental feedback on assessment items. This requires significant commitment from members of the course team, and is to be commended.</p>		
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
<p><i>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:</i></p> <p>The academic standards are wholly comparable with those for similar courses with which I am familiar. Students are achieving across the grade bands, and I would encourage the team to continue to use the full range of marks, including beyond 75% for excellent pieces of work. As one would expect, the strongest students engage with literature in a more critical manner, synthesising ideas from published sources and making effective links between theory and practice. Weaker students need particular support with the development of academic writing (including structure and accuracy) and the team provides detailed and constructive support to this end.</p> <p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i></p> <p>For some modules, the assessment load does seem significant for the number of credits awarded, and I am sure this is an area that the course team will wish to keep under review.</p> <p>I include detailed feedback on each module below.</p>		

The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiners 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
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>The process was very clear. I am grateful to the team for the smooth running of processes throughout the year.</p>		

Other comments

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

16/17(3)LLLC3969

Dissertation

I received work from ten students with marks ranging from 48% to 72% and scrutinised a sample across all grade bands. The grades awarded are comparable with work from similar courses in other universities with which I am familiar. Students had chosen a good and varied range of topics drawn from across a breadth of phases of education.

I received evidence of the grades awarded by both first and second markers, and the agreed overall grades. It is clear that there is a robust moderation process, and I would encourage the team to consider how this is evidenced in the documentation. There was evidence of third marker engagement with borderline cases.

Some dissertations are annotated in significant detail, including questions, positive points, the correction of secretarial and other errors, and developmental points.

Students are appropriately tentative with their results and associated conclusions, given the scale of their projects. The strongest students make effective links between their own data and information from published sources. As one would expect, weaker students needed to engage more critically with a wider range of literature. They also needed to develop articulation of the strengths and limitations of their methods, in order to get beyond a superficial justification of their chosen approach. Some weaker students needed to consider ethical issues in a more thorough and overt manner.

16/17(2)LLLC3952

Researching the Learning and Teaching Sector

The critique (Assignment 1) forms 70% of the module mark. Eight students undertook the module, with two non-submissions, and a range from 38% to 71%. Tutor summative comments are positive and affirming, with detailed comments on the scripts themselves. Lots of positives are indicated by ticks, which is visually very encouraging for the students. I wonder whether it would be useful to add brief comments on why particular sections of the assignment are positive in order to provide additional clarity and reinforcement? The students' work is well-structured and generally systematic. The weakest student

received feedback in a positive tone with key areas identified to help them to develop their work into the future. This is very positive.

Assignment 2: Grades ranged from 57% to 73%. This is a significant piece of work for 30% of the module mark. Student work is well structured, with presentation slides, accompanying notes and supporting materials. It is clear that the students are aware of University processes in terms of ethics.

16/17(2)LLLC2202

Curriculum & Assessment

Ten students undertook the module, with a grade range for Assignment 1 of 53% to 64%. Feedback on these group presentations was appropriately detailed, raising questions and areas for development. There are clear recommendations for future assignments. The individual written rationales are annotated by tutors with developmental points and questions. The mark is awarded for the group overall. This not an insignificant piece of work for 40% of the overall module grade. I received video recordings of the presentations, which was extremely helpful. The students presented a range of interesting and engaging materials relating to the focus of the module.

For Assignment 2 grades ranged from 34% to 70% and I received a representative sample of 6 students' work. The applied nature of this assessment item provided an engaging and interesting opportunity for the students to reflect on practice within the education system, with a focus on assessment. This is appropriate both for the nature of the award, and the development of the students' employability skills. Tutor feedback was detailed, focussed and constructive. Weaker students needed to engage with a wider range of published sources in order to develop their consideration of issues and ideas.

16/17(2)LLLC1414

Introduction to Typical and Atypical Child Development

For Assignment 1 I was able to see the grade profiles on Blackboard, and accessed examples of individual student research for their presentations. Tutor comments had been added to these notes, and students included their list of references. This element gave a sense of the individual's contribution to the presentation.

Assignment 2 forms 30% of the module grade, and I received marks for 22 students ranging from 60% to 70%. In addition to feedback sheets and copies of the students' handouts I also received video recordings of the presentations, which was extremely helpful. Tutor feedback is concise, clear and constructive, with recommendations for future developments. The strongest assignment made good use of fictionalised case study materials in order to illustrate ideas and concepts. This presentation was well structured, and provided clear definitions of key terms. This was all very effective, and the students demonstrated good communication skills and effective team working. I encourage the markers to consider using a broader range of marks (including above 70%).

16/17(2)LLLC2274

Work-based Learning in Settings for Learners with SEND

I received clear evidence of the moderation process. Tutor feedback was appropriately detailed and clear. Areas for development are highlighted to students. It was very interesting to see the levels of student engagement, and the student-tutor dialogue through the blog. It will be helpful to reinforce the importance of anonymising schools/settings for future cohorts – and I saw evidence of tutors giving reminders about this in their feedback. The module handbook was clear.

Feedback on the presentation covers both content and delivery – the latter particularly helpful in terms of developing employability skills. The essays were annotated with a good degree of detail with developmental points and positive, constructive feedback.

16/17(2)LLLC2223

The Application of Counselling Skills in Learning Settings

Assignment 1 (Reflective Journal); Assignment 2 (Case Study).

Overall, feedback sheets identify positives and some areas for development. Scripts were not always annotated, but the course team is aware of this. A positive development will be to extend the students' use of published sources, including more recent texts, and their critical engagement with the literature.

There is a need to encourage students to be cautious when addressing sensitive issues or naming relationships in order to maintain anonymity, and also to encourage caution in terms of the students feeling they are initiating interventions when they "identify" a need in others.

Students had engaged well across all grades, with relevant issues relating to counselling skills and the development of reflective approaches to these. The strongest assignments were more theoretical and engaged in a more critical manner with the literature, as one would expect.

Some of the case study scripts were annotated, including detail to support the development of an appropriate and accurate written style. It would be helpful to clarify with students how much detail of practical engagement needs to be included.

16/17(2)LLLC3945

An Introduction to Autism

Assignment 1 (Good Practice Handbook and Rationale): detailed and very specific and focussed feedback was provided to students, relating to the task and its requirements. The task itself is very interesting, and the students have clearly engaged with commitment. There were some high quality products, which I hope students will use in their own practice. Students attaining the lowest marks received positive and constructive feedback: it is made very clear where there are positive elements in the students' work, and what aspects needed to be developed.

Assignment 2 (Essay): these were annotated in detail, including developmental points and support for the development of standard English (including spelling, punctuation and grammar). Overall, feedback is clear, positive, developmental and linked to specific aspects of the students' academic work.

16/17(2)LLLC2259

Creating Learning Resources

Assignment 1 (Presentation): I saw marks for 10 students, ranging from 61% to 75%. Tutor feedback is clear and identifies both strengths and areas for development. Students have put a great deal of work into developing materials for the presentation, and their PowerPoint slides and other supporting materials are visually appealing, clear and in some cases extensive. This is a very significant piece of work for 50% of the module grade.

Marks for Assignment 2 ranged from 41% to 64%, and I received a sample of 5 items. Tutor feedback identifies strengths and areas for future development, and includes very detailed and extensive annotations on the students' work. Particular support is provided to help the students to develop their academic writing style and the use of appropriate conventions. This assignment gives the opportunity to

engage in a very useful process, creating and evaluating a learning resource, which supports the development of skills as a reflective practitioner, and hopefully enhances both current professional roles and future employability.

I noted last year that students seemed to find this assignment more challenging than others. I did not have the same sense this year, although I note that there are no marks above 64%, and whilst I concur with the marks awarded this may be an area that the team wishes to monitor.

16/17(2)LLLC2260

Education Perspectives and Policy

Assignment 1 provides a positive opportunity to engage with three theoretical perspectives, to identify strengths and limitations in each, and to contrast a range of ideas and approaches. This is a very useful addition to the overall assessment diet of the course. Marks ranged from 52% - 74% and I scrutinised a sample across this range. Detailed inline comments were provided for the students, supporting the development of discussion, critical reflection and engagement with wider literature.

Assignment 2 was awarded marks from 46% to 72%. This assignment provides the opportunity to engage with a particular educational approach and to explore its strengths and limitations. This helps the students to consider one approach in depth. Tutor comments highlighted strengths and areas for development, as well as pointers to develop academic writing and standard English. It might be useful to consider the range of foci chosen by the students, to explore whether there is any correlation between these and student attainment.

16/17(2)LLLC1417

Inclusion and Special Educational Needs and Disability

Assignment 1 was undertaken by 25 students, with overall grades ranging from 62% to 71%. Tutor feedback identifies strengths and areas for development in the student presentations. The feedback is provided for the group overall, and there is a good focus on the importance of team work so that the students appreciate that it was their overall performance that contributed to the whole output. It is clear how aspects of the assignment are weighted. I think it is positive that communication skills contribute to the overall grade, whilst the main focus is maintained on knowledge and analysis. I saw an appropriate sample across the grade range.

Assignment 2 had marks ranging from 37% to 76% from 25 students. I received a sample of 6 scripts. Tutor feedback identifies key areas for development, particularly for students awarded the lowest marks. Detailed comments and annotations are included on the scripts. As one would expect, the weakest students needed to develop the range of their reading and use of literature, and to engage in a more critical and reflective manner. The strongest students engage effectively with current policy and practice in the areas of SEND and Inclusion, with appropriate and developing critical reflection.

16/17(2)LLLC2219

Coaching and Mentoring in the Workplace

The module handbook is clear and I got a good sense of the content of the module, learning outcomes and assessment requirements. It will be worth keeping the reading list under review in order to add new publications. I looked at a range of student work from both assignment items, but was not able to see the overall tutor feedback forms.

Assignment 1 included a broad range of marks, from 36% to 67%. There were some inline comments on the work, mainly using comments boxes, and where these were included they contained some good detail and clear direction for students. There was not as much detail, or comment on structure and presentational elements as in some other modules.

Assignment 2, the Reflective Practice Blog, is 2,000 words in length, which seems significant for 20% of the module mark. There were limited online comments on the scripts. It will be useful to emphasise to the students the importance of considering ethical matters when engaging in mentoring and coaching activity, and elaborating these within their assignments.

16/17(1)LLLC2228 Using Stories to Develop Learning

The range of marks across the ten students on the module was 55% - 73%. This was an appropriate range, and concur with the standard indicated by the markers.

16/17(1)LLLC1419 Academic Skills for Learning and Teaching

The portfolio of tasks provides a well-structured opportunity for the identification of need, skills development and reflection on personal development. I sampled a range of tasks and essays. It is very positive to see the full range of marks being used by the marker for individual portfolio entries including in the 80s (if I read things correctly), although for the module overall the range was 40% to 67%.

16/17(1)LLLC3970 Issues and Ethics in Professional Practice

The range of marks for the module was 36% to 66%. I saw a sample from the full range. The students' work is very interesting to read, and they explore a range of aspects of the ethical issues chosen, supported by wider reading. The best assignments present a balanced discussion of issues, and a reasoned conclusion, addressing the dilemma in a thorough and thoughtful manner. The marker's comments are very detailed and address both content and structure. As one might expect, the weakest assignment needed to move away from a focus on description, and need additional work in terms of proof reading and checking for general accuracy in the use of academic conventions.

Assignment 2

Marks ranged from 48% to 72%. The assignment provides an opportunity to use IT skills to prepare a poster, supported by accompanying rationale/discussion. The highest achieving students took an imaginative approach to developing the poster, and produced engaging and reflective work. The Learning Outcomes are clear and appropriate for the level. As one might expect, some of the weaker assignments needed more detail on the poster and the inclusion of a wider range of academic sources to support the content. The marks awarded are comparable to those for other similar courses.

16/17(1)LLLC1415 How Do Learners Learn

Assignment 1

Marks ranged from 38% to 70%. It was useful to have an example of a failing assignment in the sample. Students chose an interesting selection of theories to explore. Tutor feedback is supportive and has a good developmental focus, addressing any misconceptions in a positive manner. Students have accessed a good range of sources, although some are a little dated.

Assignment 2

Feedback is focussed and recommendations for developments in future assignments are clear. The scripts are annotated in detail, with support for the development of academic writing as well as encouraging comments. Positive comments give reasons why aspects are good. The range of marks is from 37% to 71%. The assignments are appropriate for the level of award, and reflect the standards with which I am familiar from comparable courses in other institutions.

16/17(1)LLLC2258

Understanding Education Research

Assignment 1

Feedback includes ideas for alternative approaches, which will support the students as they undertake research in the future. Scripts are annotated in detail. The structure of the assignment supports student engagement with a range of aspects of a research project, and feels to be an effective way of scaffolding learning. Sometimes the marker used ticks to indicate good points, and it might be useful to add annotation to indicate why a point is well made. The marks ranged from 55% to 73% and I concur with the standards identified by the module team.

Assignment 2

Marks ranged from 53% to 68%. Tutor feedback gives clear guidance on the next steps in developing the research project. Feedback is thorough and developmental. The students have engaged with the process of gaining ethical approval and considered the construction of research instruments.

16/17(1)LLLC1416

Developing Teaching Skills to Meet Learners' Needs

Assignment 1

The mark range was 36% - 75%, with a spread of grades across the range. The marker has provided clear feedback on the strengths and limitations of the students' work. The scripts include detailed annotations, which identify areas for development in terms of written English and content/ideas. This detail ought to support students as they progress to their next assignments. The assignments and the standard are appropriate for the level of award.

Assignment 2

Marks ranged from 46% to 71%, and the sample received provided a range including assignments on a grade boundary. The marker has provided clear and detailed feedback. I wonder whether the strongest assignment might have warranted a higher mark, given the excellence highlighted by the marker? This assessment task provides an opportunity for students to develop employability skills. This appears to be a significant piece of work for 60% of the module grade.

16/17(1)LLLC2268

Introduction to Dyslexia

The essay provides students with the opportunity to explore their understanding of dyslexia.

Assignments showed both sound and good responses to the task within a 52%- 67% range. Essays were general well-structured and employed a good range of supporting literature. The weaker assignments needed to engage with issues in a more critical manner, as one would expect. Student achievement is in line with the standard required for the level of the course.

I accessed the presentation slides on Blackboard. Grades from 7 students were available to me, all achieving group marks of 67% or 69%. All the presentations that I accessed were of a very good quality with appropriate detail and high levels of presentation skills being exhibited.

16/17(1)LLLC3966

Who do you think you are? Exploring Learning Identities

Reflective Blog

The students' reflective blogs contain some powerful personal insights into identity and self-understanding. The life and learning journeys of the students are highly engaging and sometimes emotionally charged. They certainly give testament to the impact of the university experience on their development. The strongest assignments made particularly good links to reading, which helped to deepen and underpin the account of personal identity.

Report

The reports were well structured and addressed a range of issues relating to identity. Students accessed an appropriate range of reading to support the discussion, with those achieving higher grades engaging more critically with published sources and established theories. I concur with the marks awarded.

Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report**Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)**

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Faculty / School of:

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

Programme Manager, Learning and Teaching

Lifelong Learning Centre

**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) should be attached to an e-mail and sent to the Pro-Dean for Student Education in the relevant Faculty. Following approval by the Pro-Dean for Student Education, the School must send the response (including the full original report) 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

We welcome the recognition of effective support for student development in relation to academic skills and professional practice, and the emphasis on positive engagement with workplace issues and future employment.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

Additional evidence of moderation processes relating to the dissertation have been submitted in response to previous feedback. It is useful to hear that these have been positively received.

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:

We appreciate the endorsement of our diverse assessment strategy and the benefits that this approach presents for employability skills and workforce development. The purpose of the dissertation is to pull together research practice and utilise the various skills gained on the programme; it is good to see recognition that the process works well to achieve these aims.

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:

The team appreciate the recognition of the extensive support provided to students on our courses, and the positive comments on our assessment processes which we support with developmental feedback. We have noted the comments about the significant assessment load for the number of credits awarded and will be considering strategies to reduce this as part of this year's programme review. As part of this review we will also consider:

- making use of the full range of marks, including beyond 75% where work is of an excellent standard
- practices which encourage greater use of a wide range of literature, particularly for weaker students.

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:

We are pleased that the External Examiner has found our processes clear and that procedures for external quality assurance on our degree programmes are running smoothly.

Other comments

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

We thank the External Examiner for his extensive feedback on individual modules. Comments and suggestions will be discussed with individual tutors, and common themes explored as part of regular team meetings and the programme review.