

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 16/10/2018

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

Language Centre

*Subject(s):*

*Pre-sessional (SHANGHAI)*

*Programme(s) / Module(s):*

Law and Society

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

N/A

**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.*

This programme demonstrates that the discipline-specific EAP model used in the Leeds context is equally viable delivered in an off-shore context.

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

**For Examiners completing their term of appointment**

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	Y / N
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	Y / N
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y / N
7.	Have you acted as an 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 / N
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y / N
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y / N
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Y / N
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y / N

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

The programme is appropriately structured to ensure the learning outcomes are met. As mentioned above, the content-led approach taken on these courses is sector-leading, and the course delivered in Shanghai was very much in-keeping with this approach. Although programme is oriented towards Social Sciences and rather than Law, the summative essays were adapted to ensure that all students received a discipline-specific element to their programme. This seems an appropriate adaptation which allows for the constraints of the off-shore context.

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

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)

Research in the field of EAP emphasises the need for discipline-specific instruction. On large scale Pre-session programmes this has typically been regarded as difficult to achieve due to the constraints imposed by scale and lack of cooperation from academic departments. However, using scale as an opportunity to sub-divide the Pre-session into multiple discipline-orientated programmes, and having 'top-down' buy-in from academic departments has enabled the creation of discipline-specific courses directly relevant to students. This programme shows that this approach works equally well in the off-shore context.

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	Y / N
-----	--	-------

Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y / 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)?	Y / 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 / N
<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>The design and structure of the assessments was appropriate for the context. I noted that 20% of the final grade was given to an essay plan, and I would suggest that grading 'intermediate' genres rather than final products can be difficult as there are no easily identifiable genre features or language, and by definition plans and notes are idiosyncratic. I agree that planning is central to successful writing, and the students benefitted from the process, but question its validity as assessment and the relatively high weighting in the overall mark. There are other options such as annotated bibliographies that might work well and provide a similar function.</p>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y / N
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y / N
<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 produced work of a good standard demonstrating the academic language and conventions appropriate to their level and disciplines. The work was comparable with that of students at Leeds and in my own institution, and the work at the top of the mark scale was impressive.</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 Examiner's role, powers and responsibilities in the examination process?	Y / N
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y / N
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y / N
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y / N
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y / N
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y / N

29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Y / N
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y / N
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y / N
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y / N
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N

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

The exam board was run very effectively by Skype. I was impressed at the smoothness of the 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 Examiner:*

Subject(s):

*Pre-sessional (Shanghai)*

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Language for Law and Society

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

N/A

*Title and Name of Responder:*

Position\*:

Strand Leader

Faculty / School of:

*Languages, Cultures and Societies*

Address for communication:

11-14 Blenheim Terrace

Email:

Telephone:

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

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

**Response to Points of innovation and/or good practice**

Recognition of the success of the programme in an off-shore context is appreciated.

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

N/A

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

N/A

**Response to questions 1-7 (and related comments)***Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:*

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:*

Constraints to the discipline-specific element of the programme in terms of who it had been marketed to was a challenge. Therefore recognition of responses to these is appreciated as these were discussed with and approved by

the DSE and Deputy Head of the Language Centre at the start of the programme when we had a clearer idea of the cohort (half Law, half Sociology).

### 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:*

Comments here are welcome and align with feedback from tutors on the Leeds programme. Suggestions will be considered for next year; it is planned to continue the essay plan and seminar but just give informal formative feedback rather than a grade.

### 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:*

The efficiency of the progression board was certainly helped by Skype. It would also have helped to have a little time before the meeting for me (as strand leader) to give the examiner a brief overview of the programme in order to better explain the constraints we had been working under. I understand that on this occasion perhaps this was not possible due to other commitments, but that normally strand leaders do meet the external examiner before the progression board.

### Other comments

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

N/A