

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018–19

QAT Received 17/09/2019

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

School of Languages, Cultures and Societies

Subject(s):

English for Academic Purposes

Programme(s) / Module(s):

ELU3009: Language for Arts and Humanities
ELU3011: Language for Education

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.

In my view, the Language for Education and the Language for Arts and Humanities modules are excellent examples of content-led English for Academic Purposes provision and they should be more widely advertised within the academic community. There are many instances of innovation and good practice. For example, in the Language for Education module I was particularly impressed by the reflective tasks, not only because they promote reflection but also because they reflect the kinds of tasks that are increasingly used within Education and related fields. I was also impressed by how well the use of independent study is meaningfully integrated into the Language for Education module.

Similarly, in the Arts and Humanities module, although not part of the formal assessment an aspect of this module that I thought was particularly outstanding was the request that students create their own screencast. Not only are activities such as this extremely relevant to Arts and Humanities students, they clearly promote genuine reflection. Of particular note, I liked the way in which students were asked to 'critically reflect on... your understanding of critical thinking in light of the view from your discipline'. This is an area where there is some considerable confusion within EAP and allowing students the space to think what it might mean to be critical within their own discipline through creating a screencast is something that I would like to commend as an outstanding example of good practice.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

This is the first time that I have been able to have a full overview of the two modules and this is very much due to the massively improved accessibility and communication that I have experienced this year. I would like to commend the Coordinators of these programmes for being able to organise the External Examiner's

materials and find the time to speak to me in the week prior to the Examination Board. Both modules are extremely well run and I have no major concerns over the structure, management or assessment of the modules and believe that in many respects they reflect best practice in the field.

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

There are no matters requiring urgent attention.

For Examiners in the first year of appointment only

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 only

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

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 modules compare well with similar content-led pre-sessional programmes I have taught on and have assessed either in my role as an External Examiner or as a BALEAP Assessor. Both modules provide appropriate and clearly articulated Intended Learning Outcomes.

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

Please explain how this is/could be achieved (examples might include: curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research)

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
<i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
<i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<i>Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs, in particular: the design and structure of the assessment methods, and the arrangements for the marking of modules and the classification of awards; the quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods that may be indicated by student performance.</i>		
<p>The design and structure of the assessment methods and the arrangements for the marking of modules and classification of awards are very appropriate. I was particularly impressed by the assessment descriptors, which give a very clear visual representation and represent excellent practice. I was also very impressed by the standard of marking and level of feedback across the two modules, though a little more care could be taken to ensure that the volume and style of feedback are comparable across all task types. Further care should also be taken with some of the wording of feedback.</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
<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>The academic standards demonstrated by the students are comparable with those of students on similar programmes with which I am familiar.</p>		
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i>		
N/A		

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?	N/A
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	N/A
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?	N/A
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	N/A
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	N
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	N/A
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	N/A
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i>		

Other comments

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

In last year's report I discussed the relevance of the Jennifer Moon text on the Language for Arts and Humanities module. It is evident from my discussion with the Course Coordinator this year that a great deal of work has gone into revising the lecture slides, with the result that a more balanced view of Moon's position is now presented. I do not wish to appear to undermine what is a highly successful programme, nor to reiterate my difficulties with the Moon title, however I would like to highlight again that critical thinking is not in itself a 'way in' and for this reason I would recommend that Leeds consider introducing some Critical Theory and allow students to discuss how views about art, for example, have changed through time.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Arts and Humanities; Education

Programme(s) / Module(s):

ELU3009 Language for Arts and Humanities; ELU3011 Language for Education

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

n/a

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Module leader; Module co-leads

Faculty / School of:

The Language 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) must be sent directly to the External Examiner. A copy must also be emailed to the Quality Assurance Team at gat@leeds.ac.uk. External Examiners should receive a formal response no later than six weeks after receipt of the original report.

Response to Points of innovation and/or good practiceELU3009

It is very good to see a formative assessment being so highly praised, particularly one that involves a digital element. We recognise the necessity for reflection on the course and see this task as an excellent way of providing that.

ELU3011

The reflective tasks will continue to feature in the module in 2020, as will the embedded independent study tasks.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous yearELU3009 & ELU3011

It is pleasing that was happy with the improved access to the modules and recognises our use of Minerva as best practice in the field.

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:

ELU3009 & ELU3011

There were no matters for urgent attention.

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:

ELU3009 & ELU3011

No comments were given in this section.

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:

ELU3009 & ELU3011

We are happy to see that this module compares well to other CBPS programmes and the learning outcomes are clearly stated.

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:

ELU3009 & ELU3011

It is reassuring to know the standards of the students was comparable. It should also be noted that we have taken on board the external examiners comments regarding the standardisation of feedback headings which was discussed in our meeting at the end of the course.

The standardisation of feedback (including volume, style and wording) for all tasks within ELU3011 will be more closely discussed and modelled next summer.

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:

ELU3009 & ELU3011

We are pleased the progression and award process was satisfactory.

Other comments

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

ELU3009

Appreciate the comments of the external examiner on the issues surrounding the Moon text and agree that its contextualisation within critical theory would be desirable. However, given the academic ability of the cohort, scope and timeframe of the course, this would be difficult to achieve. Nonetheless, we will endeavour to better contextualise the Moon text and frame it, where possible, within the broader critical theory framework.

ELU3011

There were no further comments for this module. All other comments and suggestions have been responded to above.