

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:	School of Modern Languages, Cultures and Societies
Subject(s):	<i>Italian</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	All Italian related programmes and modules
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	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.

At module level, I particularly note the innovative pedagogical work done on final-year oral for IT3010 and more broadly the use of a moderation form to indicate for each module across the programmes precisely how much work had been moderated and to comment up any particular issues.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

See box above for two notable developments.

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

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

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

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	Y / N
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	Y / N
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y / N
7.	Have you acted as a External Examiner Mentor?	Y / N

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.

In line with my observations in the previous year, my overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes is very positive. Students are able to take a rich variety of modules in Italian culture, from Dante and Petrarch to contemporary crime fiction and family novels: they are also able to choose from modules that include linguistics/sociolinguistics and art history.

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)

Yes very strongly through the dissertation element i.e. students undertaking research (and often drawing upon their period abroad). The entire module offering at levels 2 and 3 is, however, strongly and fruitfully connected with the research interests of the colleagues in Italian. There is also strong evidence of pedagogical research informing curriculum design in the language modules as noted above.

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
-----	---	---

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.

As last year, the range of assessed essays and exam scripts that I saw indicated that the assessment methods structured with care and diversity and that marking is done with great consistency and rigour e.g. IT3010 provided detailed spreadsheets, marking criteria and offered a very good module of how to mark closely and consistently Italian essays in relation to a range of relevant criteria. Once again I never saw modules that had not been moderated thoroughly and classification was always consistent with the standards that I would expect of an institution such as Leeds and with my own. The quality of teaching, learning and assessment based on the student performance I evaluated was entirely consistent with a leading Russell group institution: the work ranged for exceptional first class to pass but the vast majority of the work was in the higher band (first or high II.1) and several modules in my specialist area (medieval and Renaissance) showed exceptionally strong engagement and excellent standards of overall performance. I was pleased to see dissertations this year and they too were of a high quality and indicated that supervision is of the highest standard. I note too that I was able to see and determine how classwork marks had been evaluated. The grade descriptors on 'content' modules are also applied consistently and scrupulously.

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> See comment</p>		
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i> See comment above under 17. Noting the comparability with top Russell group Universities for academic standards demonstrated.</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>At the exam board some discussion took place on the likely introduction of new marking conventions. Naturally it would be helpful for externals to be informed about such developments. Discussion seemed to suggest the introduction of a 17 point scale or variant of this which is in operation at my own institution. If that is the case then one would naturally want to be clear about how this system will operate and be introduced (numerical mark determining classification and then preponderance for the zone of consideration, one assumes). I am sure this will be the case: perhaps more importantly, it would be helpful to know about measures taken to ensure any such scheme is used consistently across the Faculties (this was not straightforward at my institution and it especially important given the high number of joint degrees Leeds offers: one would not want discrepancies in the use of boundary marks across class divisions from one unit to another). One problem with such schemes, in my view, is that the superimposition of the classification structure onto a greater range of numerical marks tends to produce variable marking attitudes. This can of course be balanced out by the use of clear descriptors but marking cultures based on the classification system may still inform the process.</p>		

Other comments

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

One point I raised at the Examination Board concerned the possibility of externals and the School having information presented to the board on each module, its median, maximum and minimum mark. This kind of overview is used elsewhere and can be helpful in showing/ensuring consistency of marking and range of marks per module.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Responder:	
Position*:	LCS Assessment Lead and Director of Italian
Faculty / School of:	Faculty of Arts and Humanities, School of Languages Cultures and Societies
Address for communication:	University of Leeds Leeds LS2 9JT
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 qat@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 practiceLCS collective response:

Programmes within the School are regarded very positively overall and are seen by our external examiners as being of high quality, with excellent teaching and student performance.

It is extremely pleasing to receive positive feedback in the area of innovation, not least because of the ongoing investment that colleagues make in this respect. The clear presence of research-led teaching is balanced with the ongoing diversity of modules we are able to offer our students. The development of the Final Year Project, commended as an enhancement, is reflected in the research methodology training offered across our subject areas. In addition, we have been commended for the rigorous approach to assessment, with clear communication to students and excellent administrative organisation. The use of different approaches to assessment to respond to the range of skills we want our students to develop is also noted with thanks.

We are grateful to our external examiners for identifying instances of innovative assessment, accompanied by clear feedback, and in particular it is pleasing to see where this has been noted as a focus of improvement for subject areas. Further good practice has been identified in our enhanced use of digital resources and of the VLE, including the introduction of online marking in some areas, ongoing discussions about Health and Safety notwithstanding.

Other areas of good practice identified included the presentation of awards to recognise outstanding academic achievements, as well as the development of key skills that link directly to employability. Praise is consistently seen in relation to high standards of teaching throughout the School, in the existence of co-taught L2 and L3 cohorts in some subject areas – a practice under discussion for wider School implementation in order to extend module choice – and in the rigour of processes overall.

Subject area individual response:

The External examiners commend the Italian programme for delivering courses that partake of contemporary broad best practices in the discipline in terms of delivering engaging, challenging, research-led teaching spanning linguistic and cultural studies in the broadest sense.

We are pleased to see that our External examiner shows appreciation about the way the Italian team has been working towards providing engaging and varied curricula. We were particularly pleased with the comments that our External examiner made regarding the breath of our modules content. The great care we have been putting into designing our modules clearly benefit the learning outcomes of our students providing them with transferable skills, cultural awareness and employability skills.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

LCS collective response:

Pleasingly, in response to the question about enhancements made since last year there was very reassuring evidence of subject areas having responded to examiners' previous comments. Moreover, there were many instances where there were no necessary enhancements because nothing had been deemed necessary to mention in the previous year.

Subject area individual response:

The external examiner commended the balance between online access for some modules and hard copy viewing of other materials. also appreciated the documentation/forms for recording the moderation process We work hard in making sure that University regulations are consistently adhered to in a fair and equitable manner and we are pleased that this was confirmed by our EE in report.

The External Examiners positive feedback on the high standard of dissertations is particularly encouraging in view of the new compulsory FYP.

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:

LCS collective response:

Only five of the School's 30 external examiners for UG programmes raised matters for urgent attention. Two of these concerns the implementation of the University policy that all students starting their degree in 2017-18 must undertake a 40-credit Final Year Project (a Final Year Project became compulsory for all students starting their degree in 2014-15). One external examiner was concerned that this would impact upon the provision of a wide range of Level 3 optional modules, restrict the development of employability skills, and that some students would not be suited to such a mode of working. Other external examiners also voiced similar concerns in relation to module choice, though not as a matter for urgent attention.

In 2016-17, LCS developed a suite of School-wide 40-credit and 20-credit FYP modules, intended to replace the separate subject-level dissertation modules in most subject areas. They include traditional dissertation and extended essay variants, both 20- and 40-credit translation projects and a 40-credit digital documentary project. These modules were piloted in German, Russian and Slavonic Studies, Arabic, Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies, and East Asian Studies. In 2017-18 they have been rolled out across all subject areas in the School. Students doing a degree in the relevant language may choose to write their FYP in French, German, Russian, Spanish or Portuguese.

Enrolment figures indicate that approximately 2/3 of students have opted for a 40-credit FYP, suggesting that students welcome the opportunity to undertake a weighty independent project. The variety of FYP formats is intended to address the fact that not all students are suited to a traditional dissertation format. For students taking the traditional dissertation variants, the peer group meetings, organised by the students themselves, and the presentation of their research at the FYP Conference, develop employability skills; the option to write in the target language in some subject areas enables students to showcase their language ability. The School is also exploring the possibility of co-teaching Level 2 and Level 3 variants of the same module, a system already practised successfully in some subject areas, in order to extend module choice more efficiently. Whilst we are grateful that external examiners have suggested grounds for caution, for the above reasons we believe that we are responding to University policy in a way that will benefit our students and will not restrict their options. We will continue to monitor the place of the FYP and module choice in our curriculum as part of the School-wide curriculum review and programme reform currently underway and due to be implemented in 2019-20. The School continues to discuss and work with the subject area to consider remaining concerns where there seems to be a discrepancy with wider School and institutional experience.

Another external examiner raised a concern relating to moderation of School FYP marks when marking is done within subject areas and the role of subject external examiners in recommending changes to FYP marks in isolation from the School-wide set of marks. We greatly appreciate the identification of such concerns during the FYP's pilot year and we are seeking advice from the Faculty Assessment and Standards Group. We will provide specific guidance to external examiners on the moderation of School FYP marks in May 2018.

The other matters for urgent attention were concerns about exam questions, assessment and August resit administration, relating to specific subject areas. Each of these issues is being addressed in the subject areas concerned.

Subject area individual response:

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:

LCS collective response:

We are extremely grateful to those external examiners who have reached the end of their term of appointment. We thank you for your support, feedback and collegiality during your tenure. We are also very grateful to those of you who acted as mentors for external examiners new to the role. More than one external examiner suggested that it would be useful to arrange meetings between externals and students. This is a valuable suggestion, and we will consider how to implement this during the externals' visits in June.

Subject area individual response:

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:

LCS collective response

We are delighted that our external examiners have high praise for the breadth and scope of our programmes, for the degree to which they are informed by staff research, and for the comparability of standards with national benchmarks and other institutions. Programme aims and ILOs were found to be clear, appropriate and transparent. Many external examiners also commented positively on the use of blended learning and digital resources in relation to student engagement.

Subject area individual response

The Italian subject area is delighted that our external examiners have praised the structure and design of our programme and highlighted how the aims and ILOs of individual modules reflect programme 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:

LCS collective response

We are pleased that external examiners regard assessment in general highly in LCS, and that they deem it to reflect both a wide variety of methods and a robust internal marking procedure. There was explicit praise for our transparent marking and moderation processes. In light of the University's aims to 'assess less, better', some subject areas are integrating different skills within a single assessment. One external examiner has exhorted the School to weigh the benefits of multiple assessments for modules against the cost to staff time, and to review regularly the necessity of each assessment with a view to streamlining. There were specific discussions about the nature of assessment at the different levels, and the desirability of standardised approaches to assessment methods. Discussions of these issues, informed by the Leeds Expectations for Assessment and Feedback, will continue in the future alongside the programme reform currently being undertaken by the School.

A number of external examiners recommend that attention is given to the full use of the marking scale, especially at the upper end. We are grateful to external examiners for noting where practice could be improved in this respect and agree that to do so will maximise parity and facilitate a smooth move to the 0-100 marking scale in 2017-18. There was one expression of concern that the new marking scale could have an inflationary effect on overall averages, that the introduction of criteria for subdivision within 70-100 would be helpful, and that care should be taken to map student performance on to the new scale correctly. For 2017-18 staff and students have been provided with information sheets about the new scale, which includes a conversion chart and advice on the upper and lower extremes of the scale. The use of the 0-100 scale will be closely monitored throughout this transition year. One external examiner recommended the introduction of a categorical marking scheme. The current University recommendation is for Schools to identify where the use of such a marking scheme may be appropriate; LCS is therefore currently reviewing this in individual subject areas. Work on School-wide assessment criteria and grade descriptors is ongoing in the context of the programme reform.

In terms of feedback to students, we are gratified that the quality of our feedback is consistently commended. We continue to strive to find the right amount of feedback to be meaningful to students without creating a disproportionate workload for colleagues. In addition, one valuable piece of advice has been to vary the language used in feedback and avoid over-use of language that does not offer specific guidance.

Subject area individual response

The External examiners underlined the variety of assessment in language and content modules, the high standard of student performance in both areas of the curriculum. One dissertation was described as outstandingly good for a piece of undergraduate work.

One of our External Examiner noted that some modules higher average grade profiles than others. We will monitor the situation and will take his suggestion to highlight the median mark into consideration for the academic year 2017-18.

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:

LCS collective response:

We are very pleased that generally our exam boards and the administration associated with progression and awards are found to be transparent, fair and efficient. We are grateful to our external examiners for the vital role they play in subject exam boards, in terms of ratifying module marks and where necessary moderating them, and discussing matters of comparability of student performance at module level with national benchmarks and other UK institutions. As is known, our Classification Board is held separately from our subject exam boards that confirm module marks and is supported by two different external examiners each year. We endeavour to invite each external examiner to attend the Classification Board once during their tenure and we are always pleased to hear from examiners who would like to put themselves forward for this additional duty.

Subject area individual response:

The external examiners made very positive comments on the process of accessing necessary information at all stages, including draft assessment papers, marking criteria, course documentation, etc

Accessing essays on the VLE was very helpful and the administrative arrangements were described as excellent and very efficient. We are very pleased to read this and we will ensure that our good practice in this area continues in the future.

Other comments

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

LCS collective response:

In addition to their reports on our programmes, our examiners have provided valuable feedback about their own experience, particularly in relation to access to samples and materials. Following the University-wide move to online only submission of assessed coursework, many external examiners have welcomed the availability of materials on the VLE and the ability to review these remotely in advance of the visit to Leeds. Some have commented on our hybrid system of marking work submitted electronically, with some modules being marked in hard copy and others being marked using the Turnitin Feedback Studio online. The hybrid system is to avoid a prescriptive approach that would fail to take account of health and safety concerns associated with extended work on screens and keyboards; thus, whilst we cannot standardise at the level of the School or subject area, we do as far as possible ensure a single way of marking coursework for each module. We acknowledge that the first year of this system has highlighted improvements we can make in terms of access to materials, as well as the provision of links to MP4 files to make access easier and the appropriate labelling of all online files. We continue to welcome feedback from our external examiners on these processes throughout the new academic year.

We regret the difficulties concerning access to a key for the base rooms this summer and the issue was raised with Estates, who have assured us that more keys will be available for 2017-18.

Subject area individual response:

The External Examiner was made aware of the changes in the current marking scale, to include the full range up to 100%.

expressed concerned that the new marking scale could have an inflationary effect on overall averages and suggested the introduction of criteria for subdivision within 70-100. also suggested the revision of marking schemes for language work, to ensure that student performance is mapped on to the new scale correctly.

The Italian team will discuss this suggestion at the first staff meeting and discuss how to implement it.



24 July 2017

Dear _____

I am responding on behalf of the University of Leeds to a comment in your external examiner's report for our BA Italian programmes relating to the University of Leeds' intention to implement a revised approach to marking and classification, including the potential for the introduction of a categorical marking scale.

As we progress with our discussions, we shall keep external examiners informed of proposed developments, but it is helpful to note your observations on the introduction of a categorical marking scale within your own institution.

Thank you for your report and the valuable comments returned within. The University values greatly the time, effort and experience contributed by its External Examiners to the assurance of the standards and quality of its taught programme provision.

Yours sincerely

Head of Quality Assurance

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:	Languages Cultures and Societies
Subject(s):	<i>Italian</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	BA Italian; Joint Honours Italian; modules across all undergraduate levels
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	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.

While there is no particular area of innovation in provision to highlight for this year, I would commend the Italian programme for delivering courses that partake of contemporary broad best practices in the discipline in terms of delivering engaging, challenging, research-led teaching spanning linguistic and cultural studies in the broadest sense.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

There were no major changes to the programme in terms of content or structures of assessment, etc. In terms of process, a significant difference was the availability of assessed work for some modules online on the VLE in advance of the externals' visit. There was, in my view, a good balance between online access for some modules and hard copy viewing of other materials, and I would be in favour of retaining a similar mixed mode of accessing material in future.

The documentation/forms for recording the moderation process appeared to be completed in a more consistent/uniform way this year than last year, which allowed for improved clarity in reviewing this process.

It was good to see a higher number of dissertations in Italian this year, some of which were of a particularly high standard.

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

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	Y / N
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	Y / N
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y / N
7.	Have you acted as a External Examiner Mentor?	Y /N

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 overall structure and design of the programme are excellent, covering a wide range of areas of study involving both linguistic competencies and skills and wider cultural knowledge and understanding. The programme provides a clear structure for learning at appropriate levels throughout, in keeping with national benchmarks and standards. The level and standards of the programme compare very favourably with those at other institutions.

In both language and 'content' courses, the aims and ILOs of individual modules reflect programme aims well, and are clear and appropriate to module levels and content.

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 curriculum is linked organically with staff research interests and practice in many instances. A number of more specialised modules that I reviewed on the modern period (e.g. on linguistic topics, on modern literature, or on cinema) draw directly on staff research topics, but these are also clearly built into the broader curriculum from first year onwards. Teaching and assessment methods also encourage students, where appropriate, to research topics independently, including in some cases devising their own essay projects/questions.

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>Assessment methods were very well chosen and implemented, with appropriately varying approaches and assessment instruments across different modules as appropriate to the range and variety of ILOs involved. Varied language assessments effectively covered the full range of skills and knowledge involved, allowing students to demonstrate progression clearly from one level to the next. There is also a very healthy mix of forms of assessment in modules on cultural topics, from traditional essays to other exercises such as reports or commentaries, well attuned to the specific module ILOs. The marking was carried out rigorously and fairly, and processes of moderation were well documented. Student performances were on the whole of a very impressive level, showing a consistently high quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods.</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>Standards achieved by students across the programme are very high and the outcomes I have seen compare most favourably to those achieved by students on similar programmes that I have seen at comparable UK universities. I was impressed by the high average marks achieved by students in most cases, and even in the relatively few weaker performances, there was usually positive evidence of achievement of some ILOs. On language modules, students demonstrated very clear command of key skills and proficiencies. There were some exceptionally strong performances in a number of essays on cultural/literary topics at final year level, showing considerable depth and breadth of learning on these modules. One dissertation in particular was outstandingly good for a piece of undergraduate work. I noted that some modules seemed to have somewhat higher average grade profiles than others: while this is not necessarily a matter of concern I suggested that it might be appropriate to monitor whether, from one year to the next, some modules consistently show higher averages. In this respect, it would be useful to highlight the median mark, which can give a useful benchmark for comparison across modules</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>I would like to commend the quality of feedback provided to students by markers across the range of essays etc. Students are given detailed comments on their work, with clear and constructive guidance on how to improve, on areas to develop, etc.</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

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:

I have no concerns regarding the areas listed above. I was given full access to the necessary information at all stages, including draft assessment papers, marking criteria, course documentation, etc

The full range of assessed work for the modules I was asked to evaluate was made available to me. It was helpful on this occasion that essays for some modules were made available via the VLE in the advance of my visit to Leeds. As before, I found student work very clearly marked and annotated, whether electronically or in hard copy. It was good to see a slightly higher number of dissertations than last year, and the standard of these was very good indeed.

Administrative arrangements for the assessment process were excellent and very efficient. The Board of Examiners meeting which I attended was very well organized, with excellent administrative support, and conducted in exemplary fashion.

Other comments

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

I understand that there is a suggestion that the current marking scale may be changed in future, to include the full range up to 100%. This raises a few issues:

I would be concerned that this might have an inflationary effect on overall averages within and across modules: a first-class band covering 30 points (when the 2.1 band covers just 10 points) has the potential to significantly affect numerical averages by allowing a small number of very high marks to carry a disproportionate weight when the mean is calculated.

Also, I suggest that it would be very important that clear guidance be made available to markers in the form of specific descriptors/criteria for different subdivisions within the very wide numerical band of 70-100.

In subject-specific terms, it would also be important to review the design of marking schemes for language work in the light of any revised scale, particularly at lower levels of study, to ensure that student outcomes and achievement can be mapped on to the scale used in the most appropriate way.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Faculty / School of:

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

LCS Assessment Lead, with Director of Italian

Faculty of Arts and Humanities, School of Languages Cultures and Societies

University of Leeds
Leeds LS2 9JT

*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 qat@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 practiceLCS collective response:

Programmes within the School are regarded very positively overall and are seen by our external examiners as being of high quality, with excellent teaching and student performance.

It is extremely pleasing to receive positive feedback in the area of innovation, not least because of the ongoing investment that colleagues make in this respect. The clear presence of research-led teaching is balanced with the ongoing diversity of modules we are able to offer our students. The development of the Final Year Project, commended as an enhancement, is reflected in the research methodology training offered across our subject areas. In addition, we have been commended for the rigorous approach to assessment, with clear communication to students and excellent administrative organisation. The use of different approaches to assessment to respond to the range of skills we want our students to develop is also noted with thanks.

We are grateful to our external examiners for identifying instances of innovative assessment, accompanied by clear feedback, and in particular it is pleasing to see where this has been noted as a focus of improvement for subject areas. Further good practice has been identified in our enhanced use of digital resources and of the VLE, including the introduction of online marking in some areas, ongoing discussions about Health and Safety notwithstanding.

Other areas of good practice identified included the presentation of awards to recognise outstanding academic achievements, as well as the development of key skills that link directly to employability. Praise is consistently seen in relation to high standards of teaching throughout the School, in the existence of co-taught L2 and L3 cohorts in some subject areas – a practice under discussion for wider School implementation in order to extend module choice – and in the rigour of processes overall.

Subject area individual response:

The External examiners commend the Italian programme for delivering courses that partake of contemporary broad best practices in the discipline in terms of delivering engaging, challenging, research-led teaching spanning linguistic and cultural studies in the broadest sense.

We are pleased to see that our External examiner shows appreciation about the way the Italian team has been working towards providing engaging and varied curricula. We were particularly pleased with the comments that our External examiner made regarding the breath of our modules content. The great care we have been putting into designing our modules clearly benefit the learning outcomes of our students providing them with transferable skills, cultural awareness and employability skills.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

LCS collective response:

Pleasingly, in response to the question about enhancements made since last year there was very reassuring evidence of subject areas having responded to examiners' previous comments. Moreover, there were many instances where there were no necessary enhancements because nothing had been deemed necessary to mention in the previous year.

Subject area individual response:

The external examiner commended the balance between online access for some modules and hard copy viewing of other materials. also appreciated the documentation/forms for recording the moderation process We work hard in making sure that University regulations are consistently adhered to in a fair and equitable manner and we are pleased that this was confirmed by our EE in report.

The External Examiners positive feedback on the high standard of dissertations is particularly encouraging in view of the new compulsory FYP.

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:

LCS collective response:

Only five of the School's 30 external examiners for UG programmes raised matters for urgent attention. Two of these concerns the implementation of the University policy that all students starting their degree in 2017-18 must undertake a 40-credit Final Year Project (a Final Year Project became compulsory for all students starting their degree in 2014-15). One external examiner was concerned that this would impact upon the provision of a wide range of Level 3 optional modules, restrict the development of employability skills, and that some students would not be suited to such a mode of working. Other external examiners also voiced similar concerns in relation to module choice, though not as a matter for urgent attention.

In 2016-17, LCS developed a suite of School-wide 40-credit and 20-credit FYP modules, intended to replace the separate subject-level dissertation modules in most subject areas. They include traditional dissertation and extended essay variants, both 20- and 40-credit translation projects and a 40-credit digital documentary project. These modules were piloted in German, Russian and Slavonic Studies, Arabic, Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies, and East Asian Studies. In 2017-18 they have been rolled out across all subject areas in the School. Students doing a degree in the relevant language may choose to write their FYP in French, German, Russian, Spanish or Portuguese.

Enrolment figures indicate that approximately 2/3 of students have opted for a 40-credit FYP, suggesting that students welcome the opportunity to undertake a weighty independent project. The variety of FYP formats is intended to address the fact that not all students are suited to a traditional dissertation format. For students taking the traditional dissertation variants, the peer group meetings, organised by the students themselves, and the presentation of their research at the FYP Conference, develop employability skills; the option to write in the target language in some subject areas enables students to showcase their language ability. The School is also exploring the possibility of co-teaching Level 2 and Level 3 variants of the same module, a system already practised successfully in some subject areas, in order to extend module choice more efficiently. Whilst we are grateful that external examiners have suggested grounds for caution, for the above reasons we believe that we are responding to University policy in a way that will benefit our students and will not restrict their options. We will continue to monitor the place of the FYP and module choice in our curriculum as part of the School-wide curriculum review and programme reform currently underway and due to be implemented in 2019-20. The School continues to discuss and work with the subject area to consider remaining concerns where there seems to be a discrepancy with wider School and institutional experience.

Another external examiner raised a concern relating to moderation of School FYP marks when marking is done within subject areas and the role of subject external examiners in recommending changes to FYP marks in isolation from the School-wide set of marks. We greatly appreciate the identification of such concerns during the FYP's pilot year and we are seeking advice from the Faculty Assessment and Standards Group. We will provide specific guidance to external examiners on the moderation of School FYP marks in May 2018.

The other matters for urgent attention were concerns about exam questions, assessment and August resit administration, relating to specific subject areas. Each of these issues is being addressed in the subject areas concerned.

Subject area individual response:

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:

LCS collective response:

We are extremely grateful to those external examiners who have reached the end of their term of appointment. We thank you for your support, feedback and collegiality during your tenure. We are also very grateful to those of you who acted as mentors for external examiners new to the role. More than one external examiner suggested that it would be useful to arrange meetings between externals and students. This is a valuable suggestion, and we will consider how to implement this during the externals' visits in June.

Subject area individual response:

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:

LCS collective response

We are delighted that our external examiners have high praise for the breadth and scope of our programmes, for the degree to which they are informed by staff research, and for the comparability of standards with national benchmarks and other institutions. Programme aims and ILOs were found to be clear, appropriate and transparent. Many external examiners also commented positively on the use of blended learning and digital resources in relation to student engagement.

Subject area individual response

The Italian subject area is delighted that our external examiners have praised the structure and design of our programme and highlighted how the aims and ILOs of individual modules reflect programme 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:

LCS collective response

We are pleased that external examiners regard assessment in general highly in LCS, and that they deem it to reflect both a wide variety of methods and a robust internal marking procedure. There was explicit praise for our transparent marking and moderation processes. In light of the University's aims to 'assess less, better', some subject areas are integrating different skills within a single assessment. One external examiner has exhorted the School to weigh the benefits of multiple assessments for modules against the cost to staff time, and to review regularly the necessity of each assessment with a view to streamlining. There were specific discussions about the nature of assessment at the different levels, and the desirability of standardised approaches to assessment methods. Discussions of these issues, informed by the Leeds Expectations for Assessment and Feedback, will continue in the future alongside the programme reform currently being undertaken by the School.

A number of external examiners recommend that attention is given to the full use of the marking scale, especially at the upper end. We are grateful to external examiners for noting where practice could be improved in this respect and agree that to do so will maximise parity and facilitate a smooth move to the 0-100 marking scale in 2017-18. There was one expression of concern that the new marking scale could have an inflationary effect on overall averages, that the introduction of criteria for subdivision within 70-100 would be helpful, and that care should be taken to map student performance on to the new scale correctly. For 2017-18 staff and students have been provided with information sheets about the new scale, which includes a conversion chart and advice on the upper and lower extremes of the scale. The use of the 0-100 scale will be closely monitored throughout this transition year. One external examiner recommended the introduction of a categorical marking scheme. The current University recommendation is for Schools to identify where the use of such a marking scheme may be appropriate; LCS is therefore currently reviewing this in individual subject areas. Work on School-wide assessment criteria and grade descriptors is ongoing in the context of the programme reform.

In terms of feedback to students, we are gratified that the quality of our feedback is consistently commended. We continue to strive to find the right amount of feedback to be meaningful to students without creating a disproportionate workload for colleagues. In addition, one valuable piece of advice has been to vary the language used in feedback and avoid over-use of language that does not offer specific guidance.

Subject area individual response

The External examiners underlined the variety of assessment in language and content modules, the high standard of student performance in both areas of the curriculum. One dissertation was described as outstandingly good for a piece of undergraduate work.

One of our External Examiner noted that some modules higher average grade profiles than others. We will monitor the situation and will take his suggestion to highlight the median mark into consideration for the academic year 2017-18.

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:

LCS collective response:

We are very pleased that generally our exam boards and the administration associated with progression and awards are found to be transparent, fair and efficient. We are grateful to our external examiners for the vital role they play in subject exam boards, in terms of ratifying module marks and where necessary moderating them, and discussing matters of comparability of student performance at module level with national benchmarks and other UK institutions. As is known, our Classification Board is held separately from our subject exam boards that confirm module marks and is supported by two different external examiners each year. We endeavour to invite each external examiner to attend the Classification Board once during their tenure and we are always pleased to hear from examiners who would like to put themselves forward for this additional duty.

Subject area individual response:

The external examiners made very positive comments on the process of accessing necessary information at all stages, including draft assessment papers, marking criteria, course documentation, etc. Accessing essays on the VLE was very helpful and the administrative arrangements were described as excellent and very efficient. We are very pleased to read this and we will ensure that our good practice in this area continues in the future.

Other comments

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

LCS collective response:

In addition to their reports on our programmes, our examiners have provided valuable feedback about their own experience, particularly in relation to access to samples and materials. Following the University-wide move to online only submission of assessed coursework, many external examiners have welcomed the availability of materials on the VLE and the ability to review these remotely in advance of the visit to Leeds. Some have commented on our hybrid system of marking work submitted electronically, with some modules being marked in hard copy and others being marked using the Turnitin Feedback Studio online. The hybrid system is to avoid a prescriptive approach that would fail to take account of health and safety concerns associated with extended work on screens and keyboards; thus, whilst we cannot standardise at the level of the School or subject area, we do as far as possible ensure a single way of marking coursework for each module. We acknowledge that the first year of this system has highlighted improvements we can make in terms of access to materials, as well as the provision of links to MP4 files to make access easier and the appropriate labelling of all online files. We continue to welcome feedback from our external examiners on these processes throughout the new academic year.

We regret the difficulties concerning access to a key for the base rooms this summer and the issue was raised with Estates, who have assured us that more keys will be available for 2017-18.

Subject area individual response:

The External Examiner was made aware of the changes in the current marking scale, to include the full range up to 100%.

expressed concerned that the new marking scale could have an inflationary effect on overall averages and suggested the introduction of criteria for subdivision within 70-100. also suggested the revision of marking schemes for language work, to ensure that student performance is mapped on to the new scale correctly.

The Italian team will discuss this suggestion at the first staff meeting and discuss how to implement it.