

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 25/06/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Centre for Lifelong Learning

Subject(s):

Learning and Teaching; Learning and Teaching (Special Educational Needs and Disability)

Programme(s) / Module(s):

FdA Learning and Teaching
BA (Hons) Learning and Teaching
FdA Learning and Teaching (Special Educational Needs and Disability)
BA (Hons) Learning and Teaching (Special Educational Needs and Disability)

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

FdA and BA (Hons)

Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards

Points of innovation and/or good practice

Tutor feedback is detailed, and the best examples include comments to indicate why points within an assignment are good or how areas need to be developed.

The assessment diet includes good variety, and it is positive to hear of plans for further developments in this area.

The course, and the assessment items, provide opportunities for students to develop practical and professional skills, which are particularly useful for developing employability.

It is very positive to hear how some students are being encouraged to publish their work, which will showcase examples of effective learning and also provide role modelling to raise aspirations for future students.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Student workload has been reviewed, and is now more manageable and appropriate for the level of award.

I am pleased to see developments in the quality of tutor feedback, and in the breadth and range of marks awarded.

Matters for Urgent Attention

There are no matters requiring urgent action.

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

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

The courses are well-structured and there is a very good sense of the development of students' knowledge and skills as they progress through the courses, including from the FdA to BA. There is a varied assessment diet, which enables students to develop and evidence a range of skills. The courses are designed well to relate to practical experience and to support the development of reflective practice and engagement with appropriate theory.

Work was sent in a timely manner and presented clearly which made the process very smooth this year. Module mark sheets indicated the moderated sample as well as detailing grades for the full cohort. Communication with the University has been good throughout the year, and I have particularly appreciated support from the Student Education Officer (Admissions and Exams) in the Lifelong Learning Centre.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N

The process of supporting the students in the development of their dissertations, and of developing their plans into reality is effective and well-structured. The students choose an appropriate range of foci, and some of the highest achieving students are being encouraged to consider developing their work for publication.

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
-----	---	---

There is an appropriate match between intended learning outcomes and assessment items. It is very clear that the students receive an effective level of support from members of academic staff, including through detailed, constructive and developmental feedback on assessment items.

Some markers indicate positive student achievement using ticks or “good”. It would be useful to elaborate on why elements have been successful in order to help students to understand and appreciate this. Occasionally tutor comments are abrupt, and it may be useful to review how best practice can be consistent across markers.

In places markers use “good” on the feedback forms for work in the 50% band and also the 70% band. Using standard gradations of language across modules can help reinforce clarity for students. I appreciate that the final mark is made up of elements of different strengths across learning outcomes. This might be a useful area of discussion for the team.

35% seemed to be the general mark used for failing assignments, and I wonder whether, on occasion, a lower range of marks might be employed.

It would be interesting to see an analysis of attainment by gender, as well as to consider the attainment of students across the range of protected characteristics.

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
The academic standards are wholly comparable with those for similar courses with which I am familiar. I was pleased to see a good range of marks being awarded, and I concur with the judgement of markers.		
I include detailed feedback on each module below.		

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
<i>Processes were clear, fair and undertaken in an efficient manner.</i>		

Other comments

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

This year I completed the Information Security Essentials training (June 2018).

Comments on specific modules:

LLLC 3942 Leadership for Learning

Literature Review (40%)

There were four students on this module, with marks ranging from 36% to 72%. I received all the scripts as the sample. The failing assignment has very clear feedback indicating the weaknesses in the student's work. It is helpful that there is no ambiguity in the feedback. The script is annotated in detail, indicating areas for development and providing indicators for the development of written style and accuracy. The strongest assignment shows an excellent knowledge of the leadership style discussed. Extensive reading is used to develop discussion. The feedback provides areas to maintain and develop standards in future assignments. I concur with the grades awarded.

Report (60%)

Marks range from 55% to 75%. The use of a case study provides an effective vehicle to explore practice and its relationship to theory and scholarly writing. I found the case itself very interesting. Scripts have been annotated to provide helpful developmental guidance in addition to identifying developmental points for language and structure.

LLLC 3945 Introduction to Autism

Essay (40%)

Marks ranged from 49% to 75% with a mean average of 62%. Tutor feedback is clear and identifies strengths and areas for development in the essays. Students are signposted to university services in order to find additional guidance, for example about referencing. The scripts are annotated in detail with useful guidance on developing written style and academic conventions. The strongest assignment was well structured and had a clear focus. It showed a good awareness of learners' potential needs and used an extensive range of literature well to justify and amplify points. I agree with the marks awarded.

Good Practice Handbook (60%)

Marks ranged from 39% to 70%. I saw examples of some detailed and well-constructed handbooks. It would be useful to consider how analysis is identified within the assignment, whether across the submission as a whole or within the short rationale, as this accounts for 40% of the mark. Positive elements were identified on scripts using ticks, and support was provided through identifying areas for development in the use of English language. I concur with the judgements made by the markers.

LLLC 3952 Researching the Learning and Teaching Sector

Critique (70%)

Tutor feedback is clear. The failing assignment receives very focussed and detailed feedback, giving the student a clear indication of the reasons why their work is weak and identifying ways of developing it in the future. Scripts are

annotated in detail including indications to develop both style and academic conventions. Stronger assignments employ a good range of relevant and recent sources suggesting that students are able to search and appraise publications. This is a useful assignment which helps students to develop skills of critical reflection when engaging with literature.

Proposal (30%)

Twelve students achieved marks ranging from 55% to 75%. This is an extensive piece of work for 30% of the module marks, involving a research proposal and a presentation. Tutor feedback provides indications of areas for development on all scripts that I sampled, including the strongest. The assignments are well structured and the students have chosen interesting and appropriate foci. There were some strong examples of effective planning for the research process. It may be useful to reflect on whether/how literature is used to support the process of identifying and justifying both methodology and methods.

LLLC 1417 Inclusion and SEND

Presentation (50%)

Marks for the group presentation ranged from 54% to 72%. I was able to view four examples across the full range. There was clear evidence of the moderation process. I concur with the marks awarded.

Essay (50%)

Of the 21 students in the cohort, marks ranged from 36% to 75%. Student scripts were annotated in detail, with guidance to develop written style, questions and comments. Feedback on the mark sheets is both clear and detailed, with focussed areas for future development. The assignments themselves show a good grasp of issues relating to inclusion with regard to SEND. The strongest assignments make very effective use of literature to present and support ideas, and are well-structured. This bodes well for progression to the next academic level. Weaker students needed to use the assignment brief to appreciate the focus of the assignment more fully. Students had accessed a good range of texts, including recent and topical items. I concur with the grades awarded.

LLLC 2223 Application of Counselling Skills

Reflective Journal (50%)

Tutor feedback is clear and focussed. There are clear indications why the failing assignment has not fulfilled expectations. The weakest assignment is highly descriptive, with limited interaction with the content of the module. Mid-range assignments show some good reflection on ideas and issues raised during the module, but do not engage with literature to any significant degree. The latter might help students to make additional links between theory and practice, as indicated in the expectations for work at Level 2. The highest achieving students engage with literature and practice effectively. There are examples of careful reflection on practice and experience, with students anonymising people and situations in an appropriate manner. There is evidence of interaction with learning from the module, and it is clear that students have become more self-aware and aware of the behaviours of others as a result.

Case Study (50%)

The weakest assignments are highly descriptive, and there is a sense that one student has struggled to identify situations in which to apply learning from the module, and has not assimilated that learning. Another has just recounted their interaction with the client. Tutor comments on these scripts are supportive in trying to help the students to consider how to develop the case studies through greater interaction with the content of the module. Across the sample, students have anonymised situations and persons appropriately. There is interaction with literature across the passing grade bands, and it is clear that all students have sought to apply learning from the module within practice or wider life experience.

LLLC 2274 WBL in Settings for SEND

Blog (30%)

Feedback on this assignment was provided weekly. The points are clear and detailed, providing guidance for developments in subsequent weeks. Communication between the students and tutor is clear and well evidenced. I was not quite sure how the provision of a bibliography related to the blog entries themselves (although I appreciate this is not a references list). Are the blog entries marked at the end of the process (handwritten annotations from the tutor) or is the process ongoing during the development of the blog (or both)? The latter would potentially involve a repetitive process for the marker.

Presentation (30%)

Marks ranged from 59% to 68%, with 17 of 20 students receiving a mark in the 2 (i) range. Students had chosen an interesting range of foci. Some of the PowerPoint presentations could have been developed to make them more visually appealing and readable, although when printed on paper the content was clear. I was able to view three presentations.

WBL Report (40%)

Tutor comments on the feedback form are detailed and focussed. An overall comment makes particular note of the students' engagement with practice and how learning may impact within their work setting. Scripts are annotated in detail, including pointers to develop written style, structure and the use of academic conventions. The assignment provides opportunity for students to outline and reflect upon practice, with the strongest students making some good use of literature to develop and to justify discussion. This is an area it may be worth exploring, to consider how students have used texts indicated in the bibliography within the report.

Marks for the module overall ranged from 50% to 72% with a mean average of 60 (excluding two non-submissions).

LLLC 1414 Typical and Atypical Child Development

Presentation (40%)

I saw presentation notes which provided a helpful summary, including a bibliography.

Case Study (60%)

The strongest assignments provided interesting and well-structured reflections on the case study. Literature was used to support ideas, including appropriate theory. There was good personal reflection on the part of the student. As one may expect, weaker assignments were more subjective and needed to focus more closely on the requirements of the assignment. Tutor comments on the scripts are both clear and constructive. There is direction in terms of developing argument and discussion, and also to develop academic style, structure and conventions. This is a very interesting assignment that provides the opportunity to make connections between theory and practice.

LLLC 2202 Curriculum and Assessment

Rationale

Marks ranged from 58% to 75%. I sampled across the range. The lesson rationales were generally well written and had a clear structure. Tutor comments addressed structure and correct use of language, as well as developmental points and addressing misconceptions. As one would expect, the highest attaining students make effective use of literature to support the rationale, with developing levels of critical engagement. This assignment makes particularly good use of the students' professional knowledge and skills, supporting reflection on planning and process.

Lesson Plan

Lesson plans were clear and well structured, and identified strengths and areas of learning/development from the lesson. Are students able to identify an individual need if they have a disability etc. for a group activity such as this, or for a group presentation?

Curriculum essay

This assignment provides an interesting opportunity to explore the reasoning behind curriculum design. Students drew on historical developments as well as current practice, using their reading to support and evidence ideas. The strongest assignments were very well written and highly engaging; I very much enjoyed reading them. Tutor comments were clear and developmental, including areas for further consideration on the strongest scripts.

LLLC 2259 Creating Learning Resources

Presentation (50%)

Marks ranged from 56% to 73%. Resources were presented to a high standard. I saw a range of products, which had a very clear application to professional practice. This is a highly engaging assignment, and there was a good

range of styles of presentation. Student work was detailed, with very good practical application. I feel that this assignment is a particularly good example of effective practice in assessing a wide range of knowledge and skills.

Learning Resource Report (50%)

Marks ranged from 56% to 74%, with six students achieving in the first class grade band. This is very positive year on year progress, having noted last year that the highest mark was 64%, and the previous year indicating a sense that students had found the assignment difficult. The strongest assignments presented a very clear and well-reasoned rationale for the learning resource and its design. There is some good awareness of the effectiveness of the resource, and potential factors affecting success and limitations. Students across levels of achievement provided a clear indication of the research process. It will be useful to review online data collection methods in the light of GDPR. I concur with the marks awarded.

LLLC 2219 Coaching and Mentoring in the Workplace

Essay (50%)

Essays showed a sound grasp of key ideas about mentoring and coaching and some of the differences between the two. Students drew on a range of literature, including common approaches. Tutor comments acknowledge points that students have made effectively and raise questions for further consideration. There are some indications of how spelling, punctuation and grammar might be developed. Marks ranged from 44% to 69%, with a mean average of 59%. It may be interesting to consider what would constitute a first class assignment, as the highest mark last year was 67%.

Reflective Review (50%)

These assignments showed good interaction with both process and theory/models of coaching. Tutor feedback was constructive and positive, highlighting good practice and aspects of effective reflection on practice. Students were aware of some of the complexities of the coach-coachee relationship and how these impacted on their experience. There seemed to have been quite a few referrals for this assignment (six of the ten) which may indicate that workload issues or timings would benefit from monitoring.

LLLC 2260 Education Perspectives and Policy

Critique (50%)

Marks ranged from 43% to 71%. Tutor feedback is particularly helpful to facilitate the development of written style and, for the weaker students, a more concise and focussed approach to the assignment. It is positive to see this development. All students developed discussion about their chosen theoretical approach, using reading to support the elaboration of ideas, and in the best cases to develop levels of critique.

Essay (50%)

Generally, students had chosen an appropriate focus for the assignment, although some of the weaker students would have benefitted from referring to module guidance in more detail. Tutor feedback provides areas for development both in terms of content and written style/academic conventions. It is constructive and clear. All students received feedback on further developments for their work, including the highest attaining students. Tutor comments included suggesting different ways of thinking about ideas, or adding additional facets to the discussion. Marks ranged from 39% to 70%. It would be interesting to know student views on borderline marks (i.e. those ending in 9).

LLLC 3969 Dissertation

I saw a range of four dissertations from 57% to 72% across the six submissions. The dissertations were well structured, and explored a very interesting range of appropriate foci relating to professional practice and interests. Generally, there was a good developing understanding of research paradigms and methodologies. Some were annotated with corrections and comments, but not all. It would be useful to review whether evidence of the formal approval of ethical procedures should be appended. Students did explore ethical issues within the text of the dissertation, and this will be an area to review and develop, including how risks are anticipated and minimised. It will be useful to review how data is stored, and how consent is gained, in the light of new legislation, and whether children should be asked to give consent as well as their parents/carers being asked.

LLLC1415 How do Learners Learn?

Essay 50%

Grades ranged from 49% to 72% across 24 students. Feedback provided a summary of student achievements, with a helpful focus. There were recommendations for future developments. Scripts were annotated in detail, including to support the development of written English, and detailed comments identifying areas for further development or consideration. I concur with the grades awarded.

Case Study 50%

Again, tutor feedback provided strengths and areas for development, presented in a clear, concise and accessible manner. Grades ranged from 37% to 73% across 24 students. Tutor comments were constructive, including one particular example of very supportive guidance for the weakest assignment. Scripts were annotated with helpful detail, including questions and developmental points. Feedback on the strongest assignment also included developmental points, which is not always an easy thing to achieve.

LLLC1416 Developing Teaching Skills

Portfolio and Presentation (100%)

Marks for the 29 students ranged from 41% to 76%. Tutor feedback was clear and focussed. It addressed student misconceptions as well as strengths and areas for development. Scripts were annotated in detail. It was very helpful to be able to see recordings of the presentations. The students' engagement and enthusiasm came across well, as did the ways in which they engaged their peers in learning activities. It would be useful to consider whether the "what we are looking for" section needs further additions relating to presentation skills. This would acknowledge the presentation element of the assignment more (although the feedback does reflect this). Is there any possibility that those presenting later in the process might be advantaged by observing others, or the peer feedback process?

I haven't seen marking in red pen for a long time, and I wondered how the students react to this compared with their own practices in work-based/education settings?

LLLC1419 Academic Skills for Learning and Teaching

I scrutinised reflective essays across the range from 53% to 74%. This cohort has achieved slightly better than last year's, and I am pleased to see that students have achieved into the 70% grade band. I concur with the grades awarded. Scripts are annotated with supporting and constructive detail, including focussed elements of praise and support for developing academic writing. Students showed the ability to reflect on their own experience across all the assignments that I read. Personal insights were expressed in an appropriate way. Essays had good structure, and the best had a well-developed formal tone and a good grasp of academic conventions.

LLLC2228 Using Stories to Develop Learning

Eight students had undertaken this module, achieving overall grades ranging from 63% to 69%. I felt the module handbook provided useful support for this module, particularly given its practical focus.

Practical (60%)

Marks ranged from 68% to 71%.

The commentary provided some interesting insights into the students' intentions and storybook designs. Tutor comments were constructive and identify the strengths within the assignment. Students achieved highly in this element, which is perhaps to be expected given their professional backgrounds and experience. The individual commentary is a useful addition to this assignment.

Presentation (40%)

Marks ranged from 56% to 70%.

LLLC2258 Understanding Educational Research

Proposal (30%)

The feedback sheet included overall comments, including strengths and areas to develop. The scripts included ticks to indicate positive elements, with some brief annotation identifying key issues. Where the marker identifies a misplaced X on the high risk ethical issues form, it would be interesting to know what the process is for resubmission or amendment. Can the students proceed without this? It would be interesting to consider how to develop feedback further to the strongest students in order to add challenge and stretch. The feedback for this

assignment felt a little more direct or to the point than for other modules / assessment items, and it might be worth considering consistency.

Written assignment (70%)

Scripts were annotated with brief comments, and positive points identified with ticks. It would be worth considering how to aid students in understanding what they have done well, and why.

The structure of the assignments was helpful and easy to follow, and I got a sense that this supported the students' completion of the tasks. It might be worth encouraging students to access the most recent editions of published texts, or to help them in appreciating that books are re-released in updated form.

I sampled a range of scripts including some high achieving students, attaining grades in the 70s and one 80%. Marks ranged from 42% to 80%. It is positive to see a broad range being employed, particularly to recognise strong pieces of work.

LLLC2268 Introduction to Dyslexia

18 students undertook this module.

Presentation 30%

Marks ranged from 68% to 73%. Assignment notes were detailed and tutors have added supportive developmental comments and questions. Students used a good range of appropriate and up to date sources. The notes gave a good flavour of the content of the presentations, and showed an awareness of a range of key issues relating to dyslexia and other needs.

Essay 70%

Marks ranged from 46% to 72%. Tutor comments were supportive and provided opportunities for students to reflect further on the content of the essays as well as providing support for the development of more formal academic writing. The best assignments were well structured, used a range of appropriate and up-to-date references, and used literature to support and develop a discussion of ideas and concepts. Weaker students still showed a grasp of key ideas and had engaged with the requirements of the task, albeit at a less critical level.

LLLC3966 Exploring Learning Identities

10 students completed the module.

Reflective Blog (30%)

Marks ranged from 43% to 75%. I concur with the marks awarded. Comments on student work were detailed and developmental, including identifying areas for further reading and links to theory. The students have provided reflective and highly personal reflections on their learning journey. All the student work that I sampled engaged with literature as a part of the reflective process, with the strongest pieces of work selecting particularly appropriate and pertinent reading, and using this to develop critical reflection. My perception (which I hope is accurate) is that students have engaged more effectively in integrating theory and wider reading than last year.

One student submitted a particularly emotive outline of their personal struggle, which whilst powerful as a piece of writing was not strong in terms of academic engagement or reflection. The tutor comments addressed the need for further development in an empathetic and supportive manner, whilst also addressing the limitations of the assignment in an appropriate way. I think this is to be commended.

Report (70%)

The strongest assignments showed effective engagement with theory and well-developed critical reflection. Tutor comments on the scripts are detailed, supportive and developmental. Students used a range of texts and theories, and generally showed a good awareness of some of the classic players. Reports were well-structured and organised. I concur with the grades awarded.

Half the students submitted this assignment late (which I appreciate can be for very good reason). I wonder this suggests a particular "pinch point" in the academic year for a report of this length?

LLLC3970 Issues and Ethics Professional Practice

There were 14 students on this module.

Essay (50%)

Marks ranged from 55% to 71%.

Students had engaged well with ethical issues across a range of experiences drawn from practice and experience. A range of interesting and engaging ethical issues had been selected for consideration. Students had accessed a variety of sources and engaged well with a range of reading. Tutor comments support the development of academic writing, with some additional comments or questions about content.

Poster Presentation (50%)

Marks ranged from 58% to 72%.

The poster rationales provided a helpful overview, and were annotated with comments to help develop academic writing conventions, and identify areas of strength within the assignment. There were some particularly strong pieces of work which engaged effectively with concepts and theories.

LLLC3976 Playful Learning

There were 11 students on this module.

Presentation (60%)

Marks ranged from 55% to 80%. I was able to access copies of lesson plans, which included some comments on effectiveness, strengths and elements for further consideration. The best plans showed a great deal of thought and care in their development and presentation.

Blog (40%)

Marks ranged from 54% to 74%. I concur with the marks awarded. Tutor comments were supportive and reflective. There was some good interaction with reading, and students across the range of achievement had clearly engaged with issues relating to playful learning. There were thoughtful reflections on both issues and practicalities.

Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Learning and Teaching; Learning and Teaching (Special Educational Needs and Disability)

Programme(s) / Module(s):

FdA Learning and Teaching
BA (Hons) Learning and Teaching
FdA Learning and Teaching (Special Educational Needs and Disability)
BA (Hons) Learning and Teaching (Special Educational Needs and Disability)

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

FdA and BA (Hons)

Title and Name of Responder:

Position:*

Programme Manager

Faculty / School of:

Lifelong Learning Centre

Address for communication:

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

This year our focus within the team has been on increased student connection between theory and practice whilst allowing scope for creativity and innovation. We were glad to see that this has been noted in responses to modules such as Creating Learning Resources and Playful Learning, where students were able to immerse themselves in engaging and critical projects. Feedback from last year suggested that students be encouraged to present their work at conferences and events; this year two Dissertation students presented their research findings at the International Undergraduate Research Conference held in Leeds in September, which was an exciting experience both for themselves and their peers.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

We reviewed and adapted a number of modules in response to feedback on workload and variety of assessment diet. These changes have been well-received by students, and we have made further amendments this year in order to update the curriculum and connect assessment more closely with practice.

We have also worked towards greater consistency in terms of breadth of marks. Alongside more detailed 'feed-forward' comments, this has helped both acknowledge excellent attainment and provide clear goals for students to work towards. Consistency in marking is a continual focus and as such discussed in both our team meetings and moderation sessions.

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 appreciate the positive feedback given here regarding standards and procedures, and note in particular the excellent work of our administration and exams teams, which has kept processes running smoothly.

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:

The feedback and guidance provided by _____ has been very helpful in focusing our practice regarding assessment. Going forward we will be meeting regularly as a team to share good practice regarding marking, and from this academic year forward all marking (besides Dissertations) will be carried out online. We will also be instigating an earlier moderation process and 'buddy' system for second marking so that we can learn from each other and across other programmes within the Centre.

A further project will be to undertake an analysis of attainment and progression across protected characteristic indicators and develop appropriate intervention and action plans.

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 note the acknowledgement that our processes were conducted in a fair, clear and efficient manner.

Other comments

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

We would like to extend our thanks to _____ for _____ thorough and comprehensive feedback on each programme module. This has been extremely helpful at both programme level and for the benefit of individual module tutors. Our response to specific comments is as follows:

- Work-based Learning module. We are exploring ways to streamline the marking of the reflective blog and improve our use of digital spaces for individual and shared blogging (taking into account data protection and confidentiality issues). Reflexivity as a general skill, and the connection of theory to reflective practice is being emphasised earlier for both Foundation and BA students (within the initial Academic Skills module and annual Return to Study sessions).
- We are looking again at the timing of module assessments and 'pinch points' with the programme as a whole. Students will be supported in managing and organising their work and encouraged to use library facilities for peer collaboration and support during the academic year.
- We have now revised the handbook for the Dissertation module to reflect a greater emphasis on ethics and researcher positionality.