

# The University of Leeds

## EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016– 2017

### Part A: General Information

#### Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	English Language Unit, The Language Centre
Subject(s):	EAP
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Academic English for Postgraduate Studies (Term 1)
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	

#### 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 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

#### 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?

No

#### 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 intended learning outcomes are appropriate for the level of the programme. The programme is focused on the academic language and literacy skills students will need to function effectively on their postgraduate programmes, and asks students to complete a range of appropriate and demanding tasks that include extensive reading and extended writing.

### 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 am familiar with other EAP programmes of this type both as a teacher and an external examiner. I can confirm that this programme compares well, in terms of level and rigour, to similar programmes at my own institution and other institutions with which I am familiar.

### 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.*

Overall, assessment methods are appropriate and effective, and there is clear evidence of double marking and effective marking standardisation. Specific marking criteria have been developed for each task, although these are rather more 'teacher-facing' than 'student-facing'. It might be interesting to consider whether these could be refined to make them more accessible to students, as they do form a key element of student feedback.

There is a real jump in difficulty between levels 1 and 2 and level 3. In levels 1 and 2 students conduct research in groups and produce relatively simple reports with minimal referencing. In level 3 students work independently with a very challenging, discipline-focused essay question that demands both extensive reading and considerable autonomy in finding appropriate sources. I wonder if the course could be structured so that the level 1 and 2 programme and assessments provide more preparation for this challenging (but effective and valuable) task. This could mean a stronger focus on paraphrasing, referencing and argument and perhaps essay tasks that reflect level 3 more closely. There could also be consideration of whether more genres of academic writing need to be considered in levels 1 and 2. There is strong focus on the research report (level 1 and 2) and non-academic genres (level 1), but no real consideration of essays, for example.

The programme may also want to consider the 10% of marks allocated at each level to reflection. It is not entirely clear what is being assessed and I would question the value of these tasks. Reflection is, of course, valuable for student learning and development and reflective writing is becoming more important in various academic departments. Perhaps greater clarity on the function of these assessments and more detailed input on the genre students were trying to produce would be useful.

All assessment tasks (aside from reflections) in level 1 and 2 have an element of 'group work'. The students do both the initial research for their project and their presentation in the same group. This raises the question of the extent to which poorly performing groups impact an individual's performance, and whether students are fully engaging with the research process at these levels. Group work is valuable and something students will probably meet on their academic courses, so it is clearly something that should be included in the course. However, the programme might want to consider the volume of group work in levels 1 and 2.

**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 students generally performed well, with students at the top end of the scale producing academic writing that suggests they would cope very well on Postgraduate programmes. The level 3 essay task was particularly effective in offering the most capable the chance to engage with reading and research from their own disciplines and produce interesting work. Even students at the lower end of the mark scale demonstrated an awareness of academic style, structure and conventions that indicates the programme is offering effective preparation.

**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.*

N/A

**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 programme and assessments are clearly informed by understanding of EAP scholarship and research. All levels (1,2 and 3) ground their materials and themes in the University context, and the Level 3 focus on the theme of 'risk' which leads to an essay and a multidisciplinary conference, is creative and university-embedded approach to the problem of having students from a broad range of disciplines in a single class. Students in this level have the opportunity to really engage with language, literature and ideas in their particular discipline which offers the best preparation for their academic future.

**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.*

- 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.*

- 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?**

- 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?**

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

- 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?**

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

#### Other comments

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

**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:**\*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](mailto: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**

--

**Response to Enhancements made from the previous year**

N/A
-----

**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:*

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Specific marking criteria have been developed for each task, although these are rather more 'teacher-facing' than 'student-facing'. It might be interesting to consider whether these could be refined to make them more accessible to students, as they do form a key element of student feedback.</i></p> <p><b>Response:</b> We acknowledge that the marking criteria may be difficult for students to interpret, and we acknowledge that this could reduce its efficacy as a tool for student development. However, the same criteria is used across all post-graduate pre-sessionals. Therefore major decisions made regarding the criteria are not made at programme-level. A small focus group led by the Deputy Director for Student</p>
--

Education will meet later this year to review and develop the criteria. Your comments will be passed to this group and we will inform you of any outcomes.

*I wonder if the course could be structured so that the level 1 and 2 programme and assessments provide more preparation for this challenging (but effective and valuable) task. This could mean a stronger focus on paraphrasing, referencing and argument and perhaps essay tasks that reflect level 3 more closely. There could also be consideration of whether more genres of academic writing need to be considered in levels 1 and 2.*

**Response:** Generally, we believe that Levels 1 and 2 offer a lot of appropriate scaffolding for Level 3. However, we intend to review the content of both levels in March (2017). The changes agreed in this review will be implemented for the academic year 2017/18. In this meeting we will consider implementing these suggestions. We will update you on the developments agreed in the meeting.

*The programme may also want to consider the 10% of marks allocated at each level to reflection. It is not entirely clear what is being assessed and I would question the value of these tasks. Reflection is, of course, valuable for student learning and development and reflective writing is becoming more important in various academic departments.*

**Response:** Following your comments in the report and your comments following the progression board meeting, we have discussed our current approach to reflection at length. We agree that there are issues relating to assessing reflective writing. In response, we have decided to remove reflection from the assessment of all AEPS levels in 2017/18 academic year. We agree that developing reflective skills is important so we will aim to embed reflection elsewhere in the course. We will also continue to encourage formative reflective writing through the reflective journal area on the VLE.

*All assessment tasks (aside from reflections) in level 1 and 2 have an element of 'group work'. The students do both the initial research for their project and their presentation in the same group. This raises the question of the extent to which poorly performing groups impact an individual's performance, and whether students are fully engaging with the research process at these levels. Group work is valuable and something students will probably meet on their academic courses, so it is clearly something that should be included in the course. However, the programme might want to consider the volume of group work in levels 1 and 2.*

**Response:** We agree that groupwork is valuable and should have a place on AEPS. We also acknowledge the problems relating to assessment associated with groupwork you have highlighted. Currently, for

presentations, we give individual language marks in group presentations. We will closely consider the volume of group work when we review the levels in March.

### 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:*

N/A

### 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:*

N/A

### 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:*

N/A

### Other comments

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

N/A

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

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

Faculty / School of:	The Language Centre
Subject(s):	EAP
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Academic English for Postgraduate Studies (Term 3)
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	N/A

**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 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 currently

**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?*

No

**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 intended learning outcomes are appropriate for the level of the programme. The programme is focused on the academic language and literacy skills students will need to function effectively on their postgraduate programmes, and asks students to complete a range of appropriate and demanding tasks that include extensive reading and extended writing.

**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 am familiar with other EAP programmes of this type both as a teacher and an external examiner. I can confirm that this programme compares well, in terms of level and rigour, to similar programmes at my own institution and other institutions with which I am familiar.

**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.*

Overall, the range of assessment methods used on the programme are appropriate and produce work that demonstrates clear understanding of academic language and academic conventions. Marking is in line with the assessment criteria with clear evidence that appropriate processes have been followed.

Some of the tasks, particularly the themed writing task and mini conference at level 3, show an innovative approach to creating a curriculum that is relevant to the wide range of academic disciplines represented on the programme.

I made some comments in the previous report relating to the reflective writing component and I support the plan to remove from summative assessment in 2017/18.

I reiterate the comments in the previous report about the assessment criteria and the need for them to be student-facing and meaningful. The team reported that this a planned project for 2017/18.

I endorse the strong process approach taken in the reading and listening assessments on the programme, as this creates authentic, challenging tasks that reflect the academic context. However, in levels 1 and 2 the writing tasks require no significant academic reading, and the listening tasks are rather peripheral to the overall assessment. The team could consider adjusting the tasks at these levels to include more reading and listening as part of the assessment.

I note there is no writing (or any other task) under timed/exam conditions as part of assessment. This is not necessarily a problem, but given that many students will be required to sit exams on their programmes and that writing under timed conditions can offer a useful 'backstop' in plagiarism cases, this may be something the team want to consider adding to the programme. Process-based timed-writing assessments that draw on significant reading and writing are something that can work well and are far removed from an IELTS-style writing exam.

I made the point in the previous report that although the students' progress well through the programme, levels 3 and 4 are significantly more demanding than levels 1 and 2. In levels 1 and 2 there is a strong focus on group work which is valuable, but it may be interesting consider more individual tasks and assessment. It is noticeable that much of the content at these levels is about the academic context rather than focusing on academic content. The material on understanding the UK higher education context is certainly relevant and valuable to the students, but it might be interesting to consider including more 'academic' topics at an earlier stage.

The level 4 PhD writing task which required students to critically review a PhD in their field is an interesting approach to the issue of setting PhD students an appropriate and sufficiently demanding

task. However, students clearly found the task challenging and some of the writing they produced was descriptive rather than analytical and seemed to focus on summarising the content of the PhD. It also produced a slightly artificial 'genre' in terms of rhetorical structure. However, there is clearly value in making students aware of the requirements of a PhD so might be interesting to adjust the task and ask students to review a section of a PhD rather than the full document.

**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 students generally performed well, with students at the top end of the scale producing academic writing that suggests they would cope very well on Postgraduate programmes. In particular, there was lots of evidence of detailed, effective instruction in academic writing and presentation giving. Even students at the lower end of the mark scale demonstrated an awareness of academic style, structure and conventions that indicates the programme is offering effective preparation

**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.*

N/A

**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 programme and assessments are clearly informed by understanding of EAP scholarship and research. All levels (1,2 and 3) ground their materials and themes in the University context, and the Level 3 focus on the theme of 'time' which leads to an essay and a multidisciplinary conference, is creative and university-embedded approach to the problem of having students from a broad range of disciplines in a single class. Students in this level have the opportunity to really engage with language, literature and ideas in their particular discipline which offers the best preparation for their academic future

**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 was asked to mentor a new external in the centre. This was very clearly explained and organised.

**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?**

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

**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?**

Yes

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

Yes, although I was surprised to note that the students are not anonymised for any aspect of assessment. However, I understand this is in line with University policy.

**Other comments**

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

**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:

\*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](mailto: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**

**Response to Enhancements made from the previous year**

**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:

**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:

*I made some comments in the previous report relating to the reflective writing component and I support the plan to remove from summative assessment in 2017/18.*

**Response:** We can confirm that we have removed this element for 2017/18.

*I reiterate the comments in the previous report about the assessment criteria and the need for them to be student-facing and meaningful. The team reported that this a planned project for 2017/18.*

**Response:** The criteria have been rewritten for 2017/18. We feel they are now more accessible than the previous versions. However, the need for concise and clear descriptors for assessors may still leave the criteria a little too esoteric for students. To counter this, we devote time in class to help students understand the criteria. We also use it, where possible, for formative tasks and drafts.

Regarding changes to the criteria, it should be pointed out that there is an institutional requirement for standardisation across all Level 4 programmes, therefore decisions relating to the criteria are not usually made at programme level.

*I endorse the strong process approach taken in the reading and listening assessments on the programme, as this creates authentic, challenging tasks that reflect the academic context. However, in levels 1 and 2 the writing tasks require no significant academic reading, and the listening tasks are rather peripheral to the overall assessment. The team could consider adjusting the tasks at these levels to include more reading and listening as part of the assessment.*

**Response:** We are happy with the reading demands for level 1 and 2 assessments. Both levels are primarily focused on language development; to achieve this we feel it is necessary to use manageable texts.

We are in the process of reviewing listening across AEPS, in 2017/18 we will add an assessed listening test to Levels 1, 2, & 4. The listening test will be built in to the Academic Strategies component, which will focus on developing top-down and bottom-up listening strategies.

*I note there is no writing (or any other task) under timed/exam conditions as part of assessment. This is not necessarily a problem, but given that many students will be required to sit exams on their programmes and that writing under timed conditions can offer a useful 'backstop' in plagiarism cases, this may be something the team want to consider adding to the programme. Process-based timed-writing assessments that draw on significant reading and writing are something that can work well and are far removed from an IELTS-style writing exam.*

**Response:** While we see the benefits of process-based timed writing there are no current plans to include such assessments in the near future. We discussed this suggestion at length and decided that, for the time being, we consider our current approach to writing to be adequate. We already have timed writing that does not count towards the assessment which can help address any plagiarism concerns. It would be interesting to hear suggestions of what form a process-based timed writing could take. The listening test will be conducted under test conditions.

*I made the point in the previous report that although the students' progress well through the programme, levels 3 and 4 are significantly more demanding than levels 1 and 2. In levels 1 and 2 there is a strong focus on group work which is valuable, but it may be interesting consider more individual tasks and assessment. It is noticeable that much of the content at these levels is about the academic context rather than focusing on academic content. The material on understanding the UK higher education context is certainly relevant and valuable to the students, but it might be interesting to consider including more 'academic' topics at an earlier stage.*

**Response:** The content in term 2 is 'academic' in the sense that most of it is focused on academic texts, derived from a variety of academic disciplines e.g., Education, Sociology, Psychology, Counselling etc. We feel that we have essentially two choices with regard to the subject matter students engage in: 1) students work in their discipline areas (as with Levels 3 & 4) or 2) Students work with subject matter chosen by us. We believe 'option 2' is more appropriate for the students in the lower levels as they have to make significant gains in terms of language development. Focusing students on a standard set of manageable formal/academic texts affords rich opportunities for discourse analysis and language development focus within core teaching.

Our decision to focus on the international student experience is informed by our belief that academic socialisation involves more than discourse socialisation, and that there is much to be gained by engaging students with the challenges ahead. We also believe that students recognise the importance and relevance of this subject matter. In previous incarnations of the AEPS programme (pre-2015/16) we focused lower-level students on a range subject areas e.g., nano-technology, MOOCs, megacities etc. However, given the broad range of disciplines we deal with, many students felt that most of the content was not relevant to them most of the time. We also found that the range of subjects did not support the assessed tasks.

We agree with the suggestion of including more individual tasks to the Level 2 assessment. Consequently, the Level 2 writing assessment is now an individual case study in which students conduct primary research into an aspect of an international student's experience in post-graduate study. We believe this task to be more demanding, and feel that it will help to bridge the gap between Levels 2 and 3.

## 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:*

N/A

## 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:*

N/A

## 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:*

N/A

## Other comments

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

N/A