

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016– 2017

QA Team received 21/06/2017

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	POLIS
Subject(s):	British Politics
Programme(s) / Module(s):	BA Politics BA Politics and Parliamentary Studies BA Economics/Politics BA Geography/Politics
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BA (Hons)

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.

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?

N/A

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

Please comment on your experience of the programme(s) over the period of your appointment, remarking in particular on changes from year to year and the progressive development and enhancement of the learning and teaching provision, on standards achieved, on marking and assessment and the procedures of the School

Standards

1. Please indicate the extent to which the programme Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) were commensurate with the level of the award

- *The appropriateness of the Intended Learning Outcomes for the programme(s)/modules and of the structure and content of the programme(s);*
- *The extent to which standards are appropriate for the award or award element under consideration.*

The ILOs and the academic standards applied are commensurate for the award of BA (Hons). The programmes I examined are well designed and the standards are appropriate.

2. Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?

- *The comparability of the programme(s) with similar programme(s) at other institutions and against national benchmarks and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications.*

The Aims and ILOs are in line with sector norms and met the expectations of the national subject benchmark.

3. Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs

- *The design and structure of the assessment methods, and the arrangements for the marking of modules and the classification of awards;*
- *The quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods that may be indicated by student performance.*

The assessment methods for the modules on the degree programmes are appropriate. The marking is consistent across the board and care has been taken with second marking. A majority of students on the modules I examined attained 2:1s.

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.*

I think the modules offered by POLIS are good. Students are stretched and given the opportunity to demonstrate what they have learned. The work I moderated suggests that student performance is comparable to that of students on courses in other universities.

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.

A number of the British Politics modules clearly emanate from colleagues' research interests and these are very good modules.

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

This academic year I mentored _____ and _____. We spoke by phone at the start of the academic session and by email during the period of moderation. Both have taken very well to the role of External Examiner in their respective fields.

The Examination/Assessment Process

10. The University and its Schools provide guidance for External Examiners as to their roles, powers and responsibilities. Please indicate whether this material was sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner.

Whether External Examiners have sufficient access to the material needed to make the required judgements and whether they are encouraged to request additional information.

Yes

11. Did you receive appropriate documentation relating to the programmes and/or parts of programmes for which you have responsibility, e.g. programme specifications or module handbooks, marking criteria?

The coherence of the policies and procedures relating to External Examiners and whether they match the explicit roles they are asked to perform.

Yes

12. Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments? Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate? If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

Yes. I read and authorised drafts examinations and assessments for the modules I was given. The nature and level of the questions was appropriate. Where there were typographical errors (or such like) I flagged this and amendments were made.

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. Scripts were clearly marked and annotated.

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

Yes.

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. _____ have been professional and very helpful. A few bumps along the way which is understandable in a period of change. I attended the Exam board which was conducted in a thorough manner. _____, the Exams Officer, was in full control of processes and procedures. The Board's recommendations were sound.

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

SCC was held a week or so prior to the Exam Board. We were informed that this was because there had been changes in University regulations relating to student confidentiality. Therefore external examiners were not privy to the SCC, its procedures or how recommendations to raise classifications had been reached.

Other comments

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

Another good year for POLIS adding value and stretching their students. Grading is sound. Feedback is copious. Well done team!

5 October 2017

Dear

External Examiner's Report 2016 – 2017

On behalf of the School, may I thank you for your Examiner's Report which was discussed by colleagues at the POLIS Taught Student Education Committee meeting on the 18 October 2017. We are pleased that the aims and objectives of our programmes were clear and appropriate, that our modules are suitable and reflect the School's research strengths and that you deemed our assessment practices and process to be fit for purpose.

We acknowledge that there have been, as you put it, "a few bumps along the way", with respect to administrative arrangements. This relates to a transitional period and we are working hard to iron those bumps out. I have confidence that the team will achieve this quickly. We are pleased that this did not impact on the assessment process, which you describe as thorough.

May I take this opportunity to thank you for the time and effort that you have invested as our external examiner in ensuring that the programmes and modules offered by POLIS are commensurate with the standards offered in comparable institutions.

Yours sincerely

Head of School

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:	Faculty of Education, Social Sciences and Law, School of Politics and International Studies
Subject(s):	<i>Political Theory</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	BA Politics BA Politics and Parliamentary Studies MA Politics (Political Theory) (Modules – indicative list only) PIED1601 Freedom, Power and Resistance PIED2601 Revolution and Reaction: Political Problems in the 20th Century PIED2602 Justice, Community and Conflict PIED3604 Culture and Community: Theoretical Perspectives PIED3609 Radical Political Ideas: Marx, Nietzsche, Schmitt, Foucault, Kristeva PIED3610 Feminist Challenges to Political Theory PIED3750 UG Dissertation PIED3760 Dissertation-Joint Honours PIED5601M Political Theory in Action PIED5626M Global Justice PIED5777M POLIS MA Dissertation
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BA/MA

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.

I thought that the use of formative assessments in the modules I examined was very good practice and feedback on these clearly contributed to the high standard of student work in the summative assessments for these modules. The detail and clarity of almost all of the feedback provided by staff and the focus on providing clear advice on how to approach future assignments was exemplary – students could not hope for better feedback and the staff deserve high praise for their efforts in this respect (that said, I have a nagging suspicion that students do not always appreciate the tremendous efforts that staff have put in to producing such high quality feedback).

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

n/a

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

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.

I was very impressed with the range and overall coherence of the modules provided in the area of political theory. These provided an excellent balance of normative and critical approaches and clearly stimulated the students to produce work which was overall of a very high quality and at the top end, really outstanding. The students at Leeds are very fortunate in receiving such an interesting and engaging education in contemporary political theory.

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, it was clear that the content of modules was closely linked to the research interests of the staff teaching them and that this contributed to the high quality of the modules.

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
-----	--	---

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

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>It was clear that considerable thought had gone into the design of assessments - I have already noted the mix of formative and summative assessment - and the mix of critical reviews and long essays also enabled students to develop their ideas and hone their argumentative skills. The assessment methods adopted clearly contributed to the students' impressive performance and this reflects very well on the staff and the degree of reflection that has gone into their design of assessments for their modules.</p>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y
<p><i>Please comment on the academic standards demonstrated by the students and, where possible, their performance in relation to students on comparable courses; the strengths and weaknesses of the students as a cohort:</i></p> <p>The quality of students' work was very high overall and I was struck by how few students there were in the lower mark bands – a testament to the excellent teaching provided by the political theory staff. The very best work was really excellent and I would encourage staff to continue to stretch towards awarding even higher marks for the best work in order to more clearly differentiate first class work from really outstanding first class work.</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>		

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:

The Progression and Awards Board was run with exemplary efficiency and clarity. Tim Heppell did an excellent job of explaining procedures and decisions in individual cases, which was a great help to myself and the other new examiners. I was very impressed overall by the transparency and rigour of the School's handling of the examination process.

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*:	Head of School
Faculty / School of:	Education, Social Sciences and Law
Address for communication:	Woodhouse Lane, Leeds, West Yorkshire 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 gat@leeds.ac.uk. External Examiners should receive a formal response no later than six weeks after receipt of the original report.

Response to Points of innovation and/or good practice

We welcome the comments on the use of formative feedback and the quality of the summative feedback. We remain committed to communicating its value to students.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

none

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:

none

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:

none

Standards**Response to questions 8 to 16 (and related comments)**

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

We welcome the comments in the high quality of our political theory provision and the clarity of the module content.

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:

We welcome these comments too and will reiterate the point about markers stretching the marks at the top end to reward and recognise outstanding first class work.

The Progression and Awards Process

Response to questions 20-35 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

We are pleased that our procedures are seen as transparent and rigour. We are committed to maintaining these standards.

Other comments

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

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 Politics and International Studies
Subject(s):	<i>International Relations/Politics/EU</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	POLIS Industrial Placement, Dissertation, Land, Fuel and Agriculture, Comparative Politics, Spin Doctors and Electioneering, Politics and Policy in the EU, Approaches to Analysis, British Foreign Policy, Europe in the World, Israel Politics and Society, Britain and the EU, Extreme Right Parties in Contemporary Europe
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

On the process side I have been impressed with the use of VLE and information technology to provide feedback and support to students and in the examination process. Within the programme as a whole, the focus on student engagement and development of professional skills (especially through placements) is notable.

Enhancements made from the previous year

This is my first year as external examiner so I have no basis of comparison.

Matters for Urgent Attention

none

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

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

For Examiners completing their term of appointment *NOT APPLICABLE*

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)?	
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y
<i>The BA programme offers a rich and diverse menu of module choice and is structured in such a way as to challenge the very best students and support the learning development of weaker students. I am impressed with the commitment of colleagues to support student learning and professional development and the consistency and rigour of marking.</i>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<i>Research-led teaching is evident in module diversity and content</i>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD</i>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
<i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
<i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y / N
<i>Assessment methods are clearly linked to existing learning outcomes and represent excellent practice. The School is now looking at developing these further so as to encompass more in the way of transferable professional skills.</i>		
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
<i>Academic standards are robust and are an example of international best practice. The student cohort is especially impressive with some exceptional performance at the top of the range and solid performance across the range, with the strength of the student body reflected in overall high performance in degree classification.</i>		
<i>Feedback provided to students is exceptional in depth and scope – and frequently goes to some length to identify institutional supports to students where these are deemed necessary. The School may wish to reflect further to determine whether this focus - especially in final year work – delivers substantive added value to students. It may be suggested that this time and effort might generate greater return to students were it redirected to formative assessment earlier in the programme/year and staff might also benefit in redirecting a proportion of this time to research.</i>		

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*

**From discussion at the Board it was clear that the School had recently adopted a new process by which special/mitigating circumstances were being decided on a rolling basis over the course of the year by a small high-level adjudicating body. This has the very significant advantage of speeding decision making and response times as well as avoiding sensitive personal information being disseminated to a large group of people. These decisions were then notified to the Examinations Board. The difficulty with this system is that External Examiners can offer no support, make no meaningful contribution nor offer oversight to the process. The School may wish to consider a) designating one or two examiners to engage with the decision making process itself or perhaps, more reasonably, b) offering some further detail to Examiners on process, norms and procedures by which the decision making body adjudicates claims for special circumstances/mitigation.*

Other comments

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

Three further comments arise:

- 1) The School dutifully applies a series of university rubrics on degree classification. These rubrics are (properly) aimed to ensure that students' performance is fully reflected in their degree award. In that process and added together cumulatively, however, these rubrics at times stretch degree classification beyond that which would be normally expected at other institutions. There are always fine lines when students find themselves on the cusp of borderlines and the institution should make a good-faith effort to ensure that such cases are properly and fairly adjudicated. I would suggest, however, that the University of Leeds might review these to ensure that best practice is followed.
- 2)

2) I understand that the School's assessment policy is being reviewed with a view to the further incorporation of more diverse and innovative assessment mechanisms which may contribute further to the development of transferable professional skills. Over the course of my term as external examiner I look forward to working with the school on that endeavour.

3) The issue of academic ethics is one which poses multiple challenges and which develops as technology evolves and offers ever more positive (and less positive) means by which information can be shared. I look forward again to working with the School to review existing norms and practice and to develop effective strategies which both inform and support students while ensuring that the absolute integrity of the assessment system is protected.

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:

Head of School	
<i>Education, Social Sciences and Law</i>	
Woodhouse Lane Leeds, West Yorkshire LS2 9JT, UK.	

**If the individual responding to the report is not the Head of School please state their position within the School.*

Completing the School response

The completed School response (including the full original report) should be attached to an e-mail and sent to the Pro-Dean for Student Education in the relevant Faculty. Following approval by the Pro-Dean for Student Education, the School must send the response (including the full original report) directly to the External Examiner. A copy must also be emailed to the Quality Assurance Team at gat@leeds.ac.uk. External Examiners should receive a formal response no later than six weeks after receipt of the original report.

Response to Points of innovation and/or good practice

We welcome these comments, in particular recognition of our focus on student engagement and the development of professional skills.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

None.

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:

None.

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:

An external examiner mentor was not offered but is available if required.

Standards

Response to questions 8 to 16 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

We again welcome these comments and their emphasis on our commitment to professional development.

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:

We are pleased the assessment methods and learning outcomes are clear and that they represent 'excellent practice'. Likewise, we welcome the comments on feedback. The 'exceptional depth and scope' of the feedback reflects our commitment to the student learning experience, yet we are conscious of the need to find the correct balance between summative and formative feedback, especially in the final year. This will suggestion will be discussed in our Taught Student Education Committee.

The Progression and Awards Process

Response to questions 20-35 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

We welcome the comment on the new process for dealing with special/mitigating circumstances, and note especially the comment that 'External Examiners can offer no support, make no meaningful contribution nor oversight to the process'. As this process is implemented in and beyond the School the comment, and the helpful suggestions, will be reflected on within POLIS Taught Student Education Committee and raised at Faculty level.

Other comments

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

We note the comment that the cumulative effect of our processes "at times stretch degree classification beyond that which would be normally expected at other institutions". This again, as is acknowledged, is a matter of University processes, which the School is said to dutifully apply. As such, we will raise this matter at Faculty level.