

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:	Sociology and Social Policy
Subject(s):	Sociology
Programme(s) / Module(s):	
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	

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.

The feedback on student work as exemplary. Staff offered excellent detail on the work submitted, no matter what the grade, staff were fair and positive, and I was particularly impressed with detailed comments on year 3 student work, when students are at the end of their programme staff gave equal priority to final year student feedback.

The range of work undertaken within modules by students was diverse and they gained excellent results, some of the work was very creative and thoughtful

An innovative practice identified is the skill to enable students to deliver on challenging topics and subjects, this can only be achieved by a confident student cohort who know that staff support them.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

This is my first year being an external examiner at the University of Leeds

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

Nothing-required urgent attention, just a few suggestions for staff to consider.

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiners Handbook?	Y / N YES
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?	Y / N NO
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	Y / N

No	
However, I have been an external examiner at other Universities.	

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
	Yes	

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

This is my first year being an external examiner at the University of Leeds.

I have previously been an external examiner at

Standards

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	Y / N YES
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y / N YES
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y / N YES
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Y / N YES
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y / N YES

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

Student achievement and weakness on the programmes is comparable to that on other programmes I am familiar with.

The structure of the programmes is coherent and content of modules both historical and contemporary.

This makes the module content highly relevant, to reflect current changes and key debates in the culture and society. Staff should be commended on the pertinent and challenging material on modules, which results in students getting access to a rich and demanding learning programme.

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

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 practice of research informed teaching is important to keep student attention in class focused and sustain the lecturers interested in what they teach (through doing research on it). As I am new to the position, it would be valuable to speak with staff on this matter next year to see how that try and achieve

this objective. In the meantime, a key source of evidence to see if curriculum design and content is informed by current research in the subject would be for staff to highlight their research outputs in peer reviewed journal articles, books, chapters in books etc. which are observable in modules booklets.		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	Y / N NO
<i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y / N NO
<i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i> No		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y / N
<i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i> Not sure?		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y / N YES
<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>		
As mentioned already all student work receives detailed feedback and they are told how they could improve work for the future or gain a better specific mark.		
It is excellent practice for staff to explain to students not only how they need to improve, but to consolidate and describe how students also gained excellent marks.		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y / N YES
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y / N YES
<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>		
Having examined undergraduate student work at a number of different institutions on comparable courses, I can say that the work by students at the University of Leeds corresponds with other student work.		
The overall assessment strategy is first class, allowing the students to properly engage with the subject and be tested on a wide variety of skills. I was particularly impressed with the comments by tutors for students on how to improve their work.		
There were a small number of cases where a difference between first and second markers was apparent, for example Dissertations.		
There was also a mark awarded on the Sociology of Consumption at the 90. While not disagreeing with the mark awarded, it might be valuable to consider how this mark sits alongside other graded work.		

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:

The overall assessment strategy is excellent and clear, useful feedback allows the students to properly engage critically and conceptually with the subject and be tested on a broad range or variety of skills.

In general, the marking criteria are appropriate and marking has been undertaken both fairly and consistently. Although, above I have raised a few issues, overall, I can commend the staff team for excellent moderation and parity of student assignments.

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 / N TES
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y / N YES
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N YES
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N YES
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N YES
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y / N YES
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y / N YES
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y / N YES
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y / N YES
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Y / N YES
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y / N YES
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y / N YES
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N YES
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y / N YES
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N YES
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N YES

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

I thought that the Board operated in a transparent and fair manner and I had sufficient information at my disposal to make a full assessment of the procedures.

Other comments

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

The University of Leeds is to be commended for the number of prizes awarded to students for their excellent work during the year. As a recommendation, I'm not certain if this action is undertaken but I would like to suggest that any student who gets an overall module grade of 75 and above should receive a letter of praise from the programme director or Head of School.

Reading through the range of student work, it is to the credit of staff that a good number of students are producing highly innovative and creative sociological work. It is clear that students at Leeds University are gaining access to a wide variety of skills and abilities, which will prove of value in the labour market. This is achieved on the basis of allowing students to engage with complex, topical and controversial ideas. Preparing them for the rigors of employability by testing their metal and ability to addresses multifaceted cultural and social issues.

An important recommendation for staff to consider is the use of visuals in students work as a source of evidence to support their argument. This was apparent where one student undertook an interpretation of a visual phenomenon but only included one visual within the work. This was limiting a very good piece of dissertation work. Students need confidence to work with such material. Using visuals, as support does not down grade the work, it enhances the knowledge possessed by the student and how it is used demonstrating research skills.

It might be valuable to look at the clusters of student marks, in certain modules students produced more 1, and 2:1 work whereas in other modules grades tended to be more at 2:2 level.

A small recommendation could be if all modules course booklets had the opportunity of having visuals both on the cover and possibly inside and in colour.

As mentioned earlier staff feedback on student work was very good. Covering, structural matter about writing, from page numbers to grammar, engagement and substantive matters of related to theory and interpretation.

Next year, would it be possible to speak with some students about studying at Leeds University in an informal context prior to the board.

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:

DSE	
SSP	
SSP, University of 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 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 are pleased that highlights a range of positive themes here including our feedback practices, the diverse work undertaken by students and our ambition on behalf of, and the support we give to, our students.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

N/A

Response to Matters for Urgent Attention

If any areas have been identified for urgent attention before the programme is offered again please provide a specific response to them here:

No issues raised

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:

No points to address

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:

No points to address; although we are pleased to see particularly noted that we include historical as well as contemporary material in our modules, their coherence, and ambition, all emphasised as enriching students' learning.

In respect of the query about research informed teaching: we will be pleased to have meet with more colleagues to discuss our practices here on his next visit, as requests. is right that this is an integral and important part of our delivery.

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:

Again we are pleased that highlights the quality our detailed feedback across all standards as well as stages; and commends the moderation process and consistency of our standards.

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:

No particular points raised

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

We will review the recommendations made including sending congratulatory letters to particularly high achieving students; ensuring staff are confident in enabling students to include visuals within dissertations where this advances their presentation/ analysis and handbook use of visuals.

We will look at any evidence of diversity or clustering of marks across modules and report on this at the next School Taught Student Committee.

We note's request to speak to students informally before the next Board and will facilitate this as appropriate next year.

On behalf of SSP, Shane I would like to thank you very much for all your work and your extremely helpful and constructive input as an external examiner for us.

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 Sociology and Social Policy
Subject(s):	<i>BA Sociology, BA Social Policy</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	SLSP 2145 Crime, Race and Society UG Dissertation SLSP2041; 3042; 3051; 3052; 3200 SLSP 3230 SLSP 2020
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	

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 am very happy to confirm that all relevant documentation on the curriculum, regulations, and procedures were provided in a timely way and that this included full sample and range of student work.

I am more than satisfied with the examples and the accompanying curriculum materials that I have been sent. Specifically, the standards set for the awards are appropriate for qualifications at this level across the modules.

The marking was in the main internally consistent and clearly justified across the board. The overall volume, weighting and variety of assessments were in my view appropriate and balanced. The feedback on candidate scripts ranged from good to excellent - both formative and summative responses were offered.

There was a continued improvement in the tendency to make explicit reference to the marking criteria within this feed-back so as to clearly justify grading, and also a small improvement in use of the full marking range.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

Continuing evidence of the very highest standards across the board.

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

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

During my tenure the programme has been consistently impressive in terms of both design and delivery. The breadth of the topics covered and the depths to which these appear to be taken up by candidates is demonstrated not only in the course materials, but also across the candidate submissions.

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.

There is continuing evidence of critical intellectual innovation across the program, something that makes Sociology at Leeds distinctive and very welcome.

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)

There is lots of evidence of contemporary research and inquiry, including by Leeds University scholars, which encourages research led teaching. Many of the research dissertations illustrate this most clearly, but it is equally apparent in the taught programs.

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
<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
<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>		
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>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>		
The standard of student submissions is to my mind excellent, and compares very favourably against institutions elsewhere, including those that I have seen at _____ and _____		
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</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
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i>		

Other comments

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

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

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Faculty / School of:

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

DSE	
SSP	
SSP, University of 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 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 are pleased that particularly highlights consistency of standards in marking, variety in assessments and the quality of feedback to students.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

No specific recommendations were made

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:

No issues raised

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:

No particular issues, we are pleased notes both breadth and depth in teaching and in student learning.

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:

Our research led teaching is particularly highlighted.

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:

No issues, general points covered under good practice above

--

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:

No issues

Other comments

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

No Issues raised. On behalf of the school, , may I thank you so very much for your work as external examiner, your support and your positive and constructive input this year and over all your time working with us.
--

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:

Sociology and Social Policy

Subject(s):

Sociology

Programme(s) / Module(s):

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.

Overall I was very impressed with all the materials I viewed. The range of modules is both broad and specialised in that students have a wide-range of choice across modules and the specific modules are very well-designed to cover specialisms in great detail with cutting edge research used to inform teaching. This is impressive. The module handbooks are excellent (clear and informative), the range of assessment methods is varied and students have the opportunity to present different types of work (diaries/logs/presentations/essays etc.). Feedback on work was detailed and constructive and students were given clear guidance on how to improve (and what they had done well).

It was excellent to see a module that embedded employability in to the curriculum – this is an excellent module. I also enjoyed the strong social policy element of the programme.

The overwhelming picture I have after this first year is that staff are dedicated and hard-working and the students in the department enjoy an outstanding experience in terms of teaching quality, feedback and the general standard of the modules on offer. It is easy to see why Leeds is a popular choice amongst students.

Enhancements made from the previous year

N/A as this is my first year.

Matters for Urgent Attention

I was surprised by the lack of anonymisation of student work. It seemed to be out of kilter with other institutions where there is generally a much higher level of anonymisation (not always complete but certainly moving towards that).

In some isolated cases I wondered if there was room for more support for the weakest students – perhaps more detailed, directive feedback?

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?	D/K

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.

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)

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>As commented above the course is very well-designed overall and each module is carefully structured to ensure that ILOs are made explicit and are linked to the course content. The range of assessment methods is broad and marking is fair and appropriate with good evidence of moderation taking place across the board.</p> <p>The feedback I saw was of a high standard but the feedback on dissertations is worthy of special comment as this was exceptional – very detailed and comprehensive.</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 students seem to perform at a high standard generally and I saw some outstanding work. Their performance is comparable with that of students on other similar courses with which I am familiar.</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?	N
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
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i>		

Other comments

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

--

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

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Faculty / School of:

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

DSE	
SSP	
SSP, University of 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 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 are pleased that offers positive commentary on our teaching, assessment and feedback practices including module design, use of cutting edge research informing teaching, varied assessment methods, the Sociology in Action module and our detailed and careful feedback and guidance to students across the board

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

N/A

Response to Matters for Urgent Attention

If any areas have been identified for urgent attention before the programme is offered again please provide a specific response to them here:

Our students' work is only de-anonymised post-marking and moderating, for administrative purposes. However the external will see the de-anonymised comments sheets, where names have been added to enable easy return of these comments to students.

I will ensure we address the observation that we might offer more detailed support/ feedback to weaker students identified as something which came up on occasion, so we are confident that we are doing this consistently.

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:

No particular points raised

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:

No particular points raised

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 _____ notes our successful course and module design, high standard of marking and moderation (especially notable in detailed dissertation feedback) and the high standards attained by our students.

The Progression and Awards Process

Response to questions 20-35 (and related comments)

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

On behalf of the School, very many thanks _____ for all your work as external and for your very positive and constructive input. We are very grateful indeed.

Other comments

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

None made