

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

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18      QAT Received 15/11/2018

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

<i>Faculty / School of:</i>	Education
<i>Subject(s):</i>	<i>MA TESOL and MA TESOL Studies</i>
<i>Programme(s) / Module(s):</i>	MA TESOL; EDUC5934 Analysing Language; EDUC5931 Analysing Language Learning; EDUC5913M Teaching Academic English; EDUC5916M Tasks and materials for TESOL; EDUC5972M Assessing language learning; EDUC 5933M Language teaching methodology; EDUC5934 Analysing language (resubmissions); EDUC5931M Analysing language learning (resubmissions); EDUC5438/ EDUC5430 MA dissertation
<i>Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):</i>	MA TESOL and MA TESOL Studies

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

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

- The content of the programme is rich and there is a wide range of assessments that correspond closely to the ILOs.
- Students are well supported academically and have the opportunities to obtain feedback through both formative and summative assessments.
- The availability of in-session language support is helpful for students whose first language isn't English
- Members of staff are providing support outside academics as well by making available valuable opportunities for students to enhance their overall experience, e.g. the provision of volunteering experience, teaching opportunities in local schools.
- The team should be commended for dealing with the huge number of students in the academic year professionally and effectively.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

- It is encouraging to see that the team is able to action on previous suggestions regarding the research methods support provision and have begun their consultation processes.

**Matters for Urgent Attention**

N/A
-----

**For Examiners in the first year of appointment**

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

**For Examiners completing their term of appointment**

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

- As a new external examiner to Leeds' MA TESOL programme, I have moderated all the taught modules from the past academic year as well as the dissertations. I believe that the team is doing a lot of good work in supporting their students despite the challenges brought about by the huge increase in student number. I am satisfied that marking has been done fairly and transparently and when issues arose they have been dealt with very promptly with minimal disruption to students' progression. From the conversations I had with some students at the last board meeting in June 2018, it is clear that they feel strongly that the academic team is willing and ready to communicate with them and that the team are open to comments and suggestions. There is also evidence that students are quite satisfied with the provision they obtained in terms of both academic and overall support, but there might be a need to tidy up how feedback is communicated to them since students who are led by different tutors seem to have witnessed slightly different practice. It is also reassuring to see that recommendations and suggestions we made on previous occasions have been actioned on, e.g. review of the research methods provision. All in all, I believe that the practice in Leeds is in line with other comparable institutions in the sector. I would like to end by commending colleagues in Leeds for their tremendous work and effort in supporting students and delivering a strong programme.

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

- There is a clear link between the rigorous research undertaken by colleagues in Leeds and the materials and content included in individual modules. Content taught is up-to-date and references to cutting edge research conducted at Leeds and beyond are made in all modules as evident from students' work.

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

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

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
-----	--	---

*Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:*

16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
<i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i>		

### Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<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>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As noted above, there is a good range of assessments that tap into various skills and knowledge. The more theoretical aspects of the programme are covered by in depth critical essays and linguistic/ language analysis assessments. There are also opportunities for students to develop their practical skills through teaching practices and designing materials for their own classrooms. The balance between practical and theoretical elements ensures that students in this programme are getting a comprehensive training to prepare them for a future career in teaching or closely related professions. They are also equipped with the skills to potentially pursue a further research degree.</li> </ul>		
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>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some students whose work I have moderated have clearly demonstrated a very high academic standard comparable to other institutions of the same standing. The assignments including dissertations they produced are of a very a high quality, this I believe reflects the high quality of teaching and strong support provided by colleagues in Leeds. Though some weaker students have either not engaged as much in the programme overall or were severely hindered by their limited language proficiency, despite the ongoing support from members of staff.</li> </ul>		
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I would like to once again congratulate the team for handling the huge volume of assignments and sending them through to me in such a speedy fashion alongside the module guides and assessment briefs. It is clear that the assignments included in this external examiner pack have been marked to a high standard. The feedback provided if taken on board will surely help students improve their work in future. There is also clear evidence of scripts being moderated. The team should also be commended for providing the opportunity for learners to submit plans and drafts for their assignments. Though the confusion some students seem to have regarding the requirement and focus of individual assignments perhaps suggests that not all students have made use of such opportunities to receive formative feedback. It is also clear that some students in the programme seem to have been limited by their general language proficiency. This is not at all a problem unique to Leeds, but it is perhaps something that requires a longer-term remedy as students are after all training to become TESOL teachers or pursuing a career in closely related disciplines.</li> </ul>		

### 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
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p>		

#### Other comments

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

N/A

**Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)***Title and Name of Examiner:*

Subject(s):

TESOL

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MA TESOL; EDUC5934 Analysing Language; EDUC5931 Analysing Language Learning; EDUC5913M Teaching Academic English; EDUC5916M Tasks and materials for TESOL; EDUC5972M Assessing language learning; EDUC 5933M Language teaching methodology; EDUC5934 Analysing language (resubmissions); EDUC5931M Analysing language learning (resubmissions); EDUC5438/ EDUC5430 MA dissertation

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

MA TESOL Studies/ MA TESOL

*Title and Name of Responder:*

Position\*:

Head of School

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](mailto: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 rich content of the programme and use of wide range of assessment modes
- The support provided to students through both formative and summative feedback
- The usefulness of the provision of in-session language support for students

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

- We are pleased that the External Examiner is happy with our on-going review of the research methods support provision.

**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. It is encouraging that he is satisfied with fairness and transparency in our marking procedures. We are also pleased that he confirms that students are quite satisfied with the provision they obtained in terms of both academic and overall support.

We need to make sure that markers follow the same format and procedure in providing feedback to students. This could be ensured through a more rigorous and systematic standardisation exercise for any module that has two or more markers. In addition, in marking dissertations, the first two assignments for each marker will be second-marked before proceeding with the rest of the dissertations.

## 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. We are also delighted that the External Examiner has commented: "The assignments including dissertations they produced are of a very a high quality, this I believe reflects the high quality of teaching and strong support provided by colleagues in Leeds". The external examiner has raised an issue in relation to students' level of proficiency, but he also acknowledges the fact that this situation is not unique to Leeds. We feel that variation in English language proficiency level across our cohort of students is inevitable, and we have attempted to address this issue through a more sustained programme of in-session language support led by two colleagues recruited from the Languages Centre.

## 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 our External Examiner for the positive feedback on the commitment and professionalism of programme tutors.

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

# 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
Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:		
N/A		

### Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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"> <li>o Excellent paperwork and proforma:</li> <li>o Well designed and clear proforma for marking</li> <li>o Tightly specified criteria for marking</li> <li>o Detailed grade sheets</li> <li>o Good presentation of course assignments</li> <li>o Well-designed assignment sheets</li> </ul> </li> <li>- There was a good range of assessment tasks on the programme , including expository assignments, analytical assignments, and portfolios of pedagogic tasks and assessed presentations.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- On the whole there was very thoroughgoing feedback on assignments, and year on year this is becoming more consistent across modules.</li> </ul> <p><b>The overall high level of student performance reflected a good quality of teaching and learning across all modules.</b></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>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:</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"> <li>- ability to relate theory to academic practice;</li> <li>- ability to understand assessment task and execute it;</li> <li>- ability to analyse the data set;</li> <li>- good academic skills.</li> </ul>		

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 [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**

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.