

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 18/02/2019

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	EDUCATION
Subject(s):	TESOL
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MA Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) MEd Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MA/MEd

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.

Within the module specifications, there is scope for module tutors to read and give advice upon drafts of student assignments. This is unusual and commendably resource intensive on a programme of this type – and is a remarkable aspect of the Leeds provision compared with most other comparable UK institutions. In particular, it enables the MATESOL programme to fulfil a core objective of enhancing the experience of international PG students in keeping with UK university policy of internationalisation. The success of this may be reflected in the extremely high recruitment to the programme for 2017-8 – both absolutely and in comparison with some other PGT programmes in the sector.

On many modules very well staged progression through different assessment points enable students to establish core skills early on in the module, and then develop them to a more advanced PG level in their summative assessment.

There is widespread use of portfolio work in for assessing modules, and for their summative 'critical study'. This enables students to embed their theoretical knowledge in suitably 'applied' type of work, such as materials development or language analysis. The use of this format for the extended piece over work completed over the summer to finish off the programme also gives those participants who have their eyes set on enhancing their teaching career (rather than going down the research track) the opportunity to thoroughly develop, practical skills and knowledge which they have acquired on the taught part of the programme with respect to a particular practical pedagogical problem or issue.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

The year 2017-8 saw the rolling out of a new and refreshed iteration of the MA TESOL programme. The course team are to be commended with carrying out a radical review of the programme in consultation with all stakeholders. For the most part the new iteration of the programme has worked well in a/y 2017-8. In particular the meetings that we organised for me with student representatives indicated very few issues arising which related to course delivery this year, and fewer than in previous years.

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

Resolved: I am happy to say that the course leader and the course team responded rapidly to the issues raised around standardisation and protocol relating to drafts in the a/y 2016-7. Guidance was given on course descriptions to students on how to complete drafts and consult course tutors, and in the 2017-2108 session, students reported much greater clarity about their expectations relating to the drafting procedures on the programme.

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

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

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

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

N/A

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 programme's Aims and ILOs are entirely comparable with similar programmes at other institutions and against national benchmarks.

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)

As in previous years, the curriculum of the programme influenced by current research as follows:

- In its unswerving commitment to maintain the links between theory and practice in keeping with the best pedagogic research in the field;
- In its deployment of progressive assessment techniques such as portfolio learning.

Learning and teaching is influenced by current research as follows:

- In the use of a VLE to ensure that students can access and engage with their learning materials at all times and in all places

The use of a varied range of teaching contexts in order to address the individualised needs of learners: from lectures, to seminars, to tutorials, to small group conferencing, to individual conferencing.

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
N/A		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
N/A		
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>		
N/A		

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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As in previous years, all assignments tasks were well-conceived and the rubric well set out on assignment sheets, which were particularly well set out, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Excellent paperwork and proforma: o Well designed and clear proforma for marking o Tightly specified criteria for marking o Detailed grade sheets o Good presentation of course assignments o Well-designed assignment sheets - There was a good range of assessment tasks on the programme , including expository assignments, analytical assignments, and portfolios of pedagogic tasks and assessed presentations. - Assessment tasks were well designed in relation to the practical context of language teaching and learning. In this there was a very good attempt to contextualise the knowledge and skills which the students were learning on the programme. - On the whole there was very thoroughgoing feedback on assignments, and year on year this is becoming more consistent across modules. <p>The overall high level of student performance reflected a good quality of teaching and learning across all 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 students demonstrated the full range of academic standards, with the top performing students were amongst the best I have seen in 20 years in the UK HE sector. In this respect the student performance was broadly comparable with other courses in the field. As in previous years, the strengths of the students as a cohort included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ability to relate theory to academic practice; - ability to understand assessment task and execute it; - ability to analyse the data set; - good academic skills. 		

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

The one weakness – as in previous years - was probably in critical thinking. This unfortunately, is a perennial challenge given the diversity of students on the programme, and I know that members of the course team at Leeds (as with in comparable institutions) are working hard to address this challenge. But I would say that the 2017-8 cohort appeared relatively stronger than the 2016-7 cohort in this respect.

The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiner's 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 would like to reiterate my view that, as in previous years, the administrative arrangements for convening the PGT Exam Board at Leeds School of Education were indisputably the best I have come across in UK HE, and indeed in HE internationally. It displays the highest levels of excellence and is a sure-fire indicator of the maintenance of standards across PGT programmes in the School.

Other comments

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

I attended each of the two programme boards in a/y 2017-8. Each visit I met a group of elected representatives from the two programmes for which I have oversight. While there are one or two minutiae of operational issues which arise, which I fed back immediately to the programme leaders, the students have regularly endorsed both programmes and the experience which they have on them. Despite the fact that a new version of the programme was being rolled out, feedback was remarkably positive with remarkably few operational issues to take note of. In

particular, students remain highly appreciative of the commitment and professionalism of the program tutors who support them on their modules.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Responder:	
Position*:	Programme Director MA TESOL
Faculty / School of:	<i>ESSL/Education</i>
Address for communication:	School of Education, University of Leeds
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 practice

We are delighted that recognition has been given to the use of a range of assessment modes on the programme and to a widespread and effective use of portfolio work for assessing modules.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

We are pleased that the External Examiner is happy with the iteration of the MA TESOL programme. We are also delighted to know that "very few issues arising related to course delivery this year, and fewer than in previous years."

Response to Matters for Urgent Attention

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

N/A

Response to questions 1-7 (and related comments)

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

N/A

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

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

We are pleased that the External Examiner's response to 'Standard'-related questions is positive. The External Examiner has given recognition to the fact that "progressive assessment techniques such as portfolio learning" are currently being used on TESOL modules. The Examiner has also highlighted the value of using a VLE since it helps students better engage with learning materials both in-class and outside of the classroom.

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 delighted to know that the External Examiner is pleased with our assessment and feedback on the programme. We are particularly happy that the External Examiner has commented as follows: "The overall high level of student performance reflected a good quality of teaching and learning across all modules." It is also very reassuring for us to see the External Examiner's comment on the feedback: "On the whole there was very thoroughgoing feedback on assignments, and year on year this is becoming more consistent across modules." The External Examiner has been slightly concerned about students' weakness in critical thinking. We are trying to address this challenge by raising students' awareness of the importance of demonstrating critical thinking and argumentation in their assignments and designing practical tasks and discussion activities that should help them become better critical thinkers.

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 grateful to the External Examiner for giving recognition to the continuous support that has received from at Student Education Office. We are particularly delighted to hear that "it displays the highest levels of excellence and is a sure-fire indicator of the maintenance of standards across PGT programmes in the School."

Other comments

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

We are deeply grateful to for very positive feedback on the commitment and professionalism of programme tutors, who, as pointed out by the External Examiner, support students on their modules.

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017– 2018

QAT Received 07/12/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	School of Education
Subject(s):	<i>TESOL</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	EDUC 5013M – Critical Study EDUC 5430M - Dissertation EDUC 5901M – Teaching and Learning in TESOL EDUC 5902M – Investigating Language for TESOL EDUC 5909M – Introducing a Task-Based Curriculum in Classrooms and Systems EDUC 5925M – Teacher Education for TESOL EDUC 5935M – Materials Development for TESOL EDUC 5306M – The Practice of Supporting Language Teacher Learning EDUC 5981M – Teaching Languages to Young Learners
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MA TESOL / TESOL Studies / TESOL & ICT / Teacher Education / YLs / EAL

Name and home Institution / affiliation of Examiner

Title and Name of Examiner:	
Institution:	<i>University of Portsmouth</i>
Address for communication:	Park Building King Henry I Street Portsmouth PO1 2DZ
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

Throughout my time as external examiner, I have been deeply impressed in general by the quality of the marking and feedback, and the robustness of administrative procedures that do as much as possible to ensure that students are well-supported throughout their studies. The support provided includes tutorials and feedback on detailed outlines, which really seems to help dedicated and committed students thrive; students I met at the university at the June meeting I was able to attend confirmed they had benefited from this. There is also a great deal of care put into helping students who are struggling, and those who do not seem to improve appear to be the ones who have not made use of the opportunities on offer, to judge from comments I have seen about missed opportunities on scripts. I cannot praise enough the quality of the feedback provided by most members of the department. While numerous markers, too numerous to name, have impressed me with their sensitively-written comments on students' scripts, I would single out _____ and _____ for special praise. I cannot imagine that any TESOL-related programme in the country is staffed by such a strong faculty team in general, in terms of the quality of teaching and assessment they provide, with such stand-out stars.

The programmes offered have evolved over the past four years and appear well-balanced; it seems highly appropriate to offer EDUC5902M to TESOL Studies students, for example, and it is good to see that 'critical studies' have become 'dissertations', which fairly reflects, I think, the research put into them.

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.*

Learning outcomes are appropriate to the level of the award and the structure and content of the programme are appropriate to the type of award.

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.*

Yes, the aims and ILOs are comparable to those of similar course at other universities and in line with benchmarks set by the HEQ framework.

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.*

EDUC 5901M – Teaching and Learning in TESOL

As I have commented before, the assignments for Part 1 and 2 very usefully encourage students to reflect on the teaching and learning of listening and speaking (Part 1) and reading and writing (Part 2) in their home contexts. I saw a good range of work, as in previous years, including well-deserved Firsts. The marking and feedback on all the scripts I saw seemed highly appropriate, including very helpful formative comments provided on Fails.

EDUC 5902M – Investigating Language for TESOL

This module provides valuable linguistic input, and it has an interesting two-part assessment. It was striking how some students scored much better on Part 1 than Part 2, or vice versa, which is a reflection of how different qualities are being assessed. Some students may have failed to grasp the case study concept, resulting in poor Part 2 work. Perhaps input on this might be reconsidered if it would result in greater understanding? Marking and feedback practices seemed robust, with decisions transparent on the second markers' feedback sheet. There was evidence of thoughtful dialogue between the markers.

EDUC 5909M – Introducing a Task-Based Curriculum in Classrooms and Systems

This is the first time I have seen work from this module; I found it very interesting. Within a spread, there was some excellent work on a topic which would be highly relevant to teachers' home contexts. The module leader is an expert in this area, and that clearly helps; it can motivate the students to engage deeply.

EDUC 5925M – Teacher Education for TESOL

This is another module led by a widely-published expert in the particular area, and the (partially revised) assessment titles reflected cutting edge thinking. The work this year was generally of a very high quality, and

this was fairly reflected in the marking. Feedback was very detailed and helpful.

EDUC 5935M – Materials Development for TESOL

This assignment encourages thoughtful engagement with materials, and some work was of a high standard. Overall, the assignments I saw appeared to be of a similar quality to those in previous years. Formative feedback was helpful, although in places the feedback had the air of being rushed; there were some typos.

EDUC 5306M – The Practice of Supporting Language Teacher Learning

This module caters very well to the needs of present and future teacher educators, and the assignment tasks are well-designed. Some very good quality work was produced, and this was rewarded appropriately in the marking. On scripts I **was initially sent**, there were no general comments, just detailed comments (which were helpful), with rubric highlighted (also useful). **I was subsequently sent the correct versions, though; these included very helpful, carefully-crafted general comments. On every script I saw, these general comments were distinguished by including highly motivating and deeply thoughtful final take-away advice, which would have renewed students' enthusiasm.**

EDUC 5981M – Teaching Languages to Young Learners

The assignment task seemed appropriate and was clearly appropriately supported. It seems very good practice to offer students the opportunity to submit a detailed outline three weeks before the submission deadline, and such a practice would no doubt have led to beneficial outcomes for those students who availed themselves of the opportunity. There was some excellent work submitted, and this was appropriately rewarded and was provided thoughtful, sensitively-written feedback. Detailed formative feedback was also offered weaker work.

EDUC 5430M - Dissertation

Communication from the module leader indicated that some scripts were third-marked because the first marker had not attended a standardization session, and therefore may not have been applying the criteria in the way agreed at the meeting. I think it highly commendable that the school demands that all examiners attend the standardisation meeting, and that the school therefore takes responsibility for ensuring that students benefit from the fairest possible outcomes based on rigorous procedures being followed.

Two of the scripts I saw were from the batch that had been third-marked. In one case, the first and second marker had agreed on a 45%, which the third marker had overturned, awarding 53%. I fully agreed with the third marker. In my view, the first marker had been Draconian, and I was disappointed that the second marker had not challenged the score. For the second script, all three markers had agreed on 56%; this seemed fair.

There was some excellent work submitted, which fully deserved being rewarded in the scores given and commended in the feedback.

EDUC 5013M – Critical Study

I saw one script for this module. I was impressed by the interaction between the markers on the second markers' sheet; this demonstrated the learning that can take place between colleagues, particularly perhaps when one marker is more experienced than the other.

4. Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the Aims and ILOs?

- *The academic standards demonstrated by the students and, where possible, their performance in relation to students on comparable courses;*
- *The strengths and weaknesses of the students as a cohort.*

The academic standards demonstrated by the students were good overall, and some of the work was excellent, comparing well with that produced on other courses.

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.

The nature of the assignment promotes deep engagement and some of the feedback is very good.

7. Please comment on the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching

This may include examples of curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research.

The various lecturers bring relevant research expertise to this module, which clearly informs the teaching and assessing of it.

8. Where the programme forms part of an Integrated PhD, please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD

N/A

For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements

9. If you have acted as a mentor to a new External Examiner or have received mentor support please comment here on the arrangements

N/A

The Examination/Assessment Process

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

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

Yes, everything was provided.

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, appropriate documentation was provided.

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 was provided with the assessment tasks. I thought the nature and level of the questions were highly appropriate.

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, this was all fine. I was provided with the assessment and a range of work from all grade bands. The work was annotated.

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

Yes, highly appropriate.

15. Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Board of Examiners? Were you able to attend the meeting? Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board?

Yes, the arrangements were helpful, but unfortunately I was unable to attend the meetings this year.

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

Yes, appropriate procedures were in place.

Other comments

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

I would like to thank the various faculty I have interacted with over the past four years for the useful clarifications they have provided, and the education service officer, _____, who has always been extremely helpful. It was a pleasure being external examiner.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

TESOL

Programme(s) / Module(s):

EDUC 5013M – Critical Study
 EDUC 5430M - Dissertation
 EDUC 5901M – Teaching and Learning in TESOL
 EDUC 5902M – Investigating Language for TESOL
 EDUC 5909M – Introducing a Task-Based Curriculum in Classrooms and Systems
 EDUC 5925M – Teacher Education for TESOL
 EDUC 5935M – Materials Development for TESOL
 EDUC 5306M – The Practice of Supporting Language Teacher Learning
 EDUC 5981M – Teaching Languages to Young Learners

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

MA TESOL Studies/ MA TESOL

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Programme Director MA TESOL, MA TESOL Studies

Faculty / School of:

ESSL / EDUCATION

Address for communication:

School of Education
University of Leeds

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 practice

We are delighted that recognition has been given to the quality of the marking and feedback, and the robustness of administrative procedures. The External Examiner has praised colleagues and has singled out _____ and _____ for providing high-quality feedback to students. It is reassuring to see that the External Examiner thinks that the programmes offered are well-balanced. In particular, we are very pleased with the following comment: "I cannot imagine that any TESOL-related programme in the country is staffed by such a strong faculty team in general, in terms of the quality of teaching and assessment they provide, with such stand-out stars".

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

We are pleased that the External Examiner believes that the nature of the feedback provided to students promotes deep engagement.

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:

NA

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:

NA

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 are pleased that the External Examiner's response to 'Standard'-related questions are very positive. The External Examiner has provided a detailed evaluation for each module and we are pleased that has found the process of assessment and marking fair and rigorous. has also given recognition to the fact that TESOL modules have been taught by various lecturers with relevant expertise. The External Examiner has raised a point about the second assignment for EDUC5902. This is a valid concern and to address this issue, we have included both face to face and online tutorials (in the form of screencast) which will enhance students' understanding of the purpose of the assignment.

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:

It is reassuring to see that the External Examiner is very pleased with our assessment and feedback procedures. For example, the External Examiner has found the feedback for EDUC 5306M "highly motivating and deeply thoughtful". This is the result of the hard work of TESOL team members. In particular, efforts and initiatives to ensure fair assessment procedures, rigorous standardisation exercises, and consistent marking processes are commendable and highly appreciated.

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:

NA

Other comments

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

We are grateful to the External Examiner for giving recognition to the continuous support that has received from at Student Education Office.

We are deeply grateful to for detailed insights and tireless commitment to supporting us in our efforts to improve our provision.