

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19 QAT Received 17/11/2019

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

School of Education

Subject(s):

TESOL

Programme(s) / Module(s):

EDUC5901M Learning and Teaching in TESOL
 EDUC5902M Investigating Language for TESOL
 EDUC5991M Approaches and Contexts in TESOL
 EDUC5992M Introduction to Second Language Acquisition
 EDUC5306M The Practice of Supporting Language Teacher Learning
 EDUC5909M Introducing a Task-Based Curriculum in Classrooms and Systems
 EDUC5925M Teacher Education for TESOL
 EDUC5935M Materials Development for TESOL
 EDUC5981M Teaching Languages to Young Learners
 EDUC5933M Language Teaching Methodology
 EDUC5993M Teaching Oral and Written Skills for TESOL
 EDUC5994M Language Testing
 EDUC5430M Dissertation

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

MA

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.
 Challenging modules which link theory and practice in TESOL, a number of assignments allow students to reflect on and apply concepts to their specific teaching context. Many modules, but not all, provide clear guidelines on the support available prior to submission. It is suggested that this be applied to all modules.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

Not known

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

For Examiners in the first year of appointment only

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 an External Examiner Mentor?	N
----	---	---

For Examiners completing their term of appointment only

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

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

My overall impression of the course is very positive. It is an excellent programme which is well structured and designed. The aims and intended learning outcome are clear and appropriate.

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)

The modules apply research or knowledge building to Language Education practice. Many of the staff are research active and well-regarded within their fields and this comes through in a variety of modules. The dissertation allows students to undertake research relevant to their context and interest.

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
-----	--	---

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
-----	---	---

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.

The assessment methods are appropriate and typically they include at least two components which is a sector norm for an MA of this type. Assessments are well designed to meet ILOs. A number of assignment briefs clearly spell out what support is available to students prior to submission of their summative work, but this is not applied consistently across modules and it would be helpful if the team addressed this discrepancy and standardise practices.

I have not observed any teaching, but student performance suggests that this is of good overall quality. The problems that weaker students face often include critical engagement with content and use of English for academic purposes as a second language – such problems are typical on MA TESOL courses throughout the sector.

The marking, moderating and feedback given to students on most modules is appropriate and comprehensive. However there are divergences from standard practices and some inconsistencies from locally engaged staff, I note that my predecessor has identified some of these in previous reports and it is unfortunate that issues persist. I am aware that Leeds-based faculty have over recent years worked hard to iron out such issue and it is clear that this work needs to continue.

Problematic areas include:

There were a number of examples where feedback comments did not accurately reflect the grade descriptors. For example, one student was awarded a mark of 48% with a feedback comment of “good understanding”.

With regards Dissertation marking and moderation my predecessor commented that “In the past, I have recommended that dissertations first-marked in China should be second-marked in Leeds, and vice-versa. I really think such a practice would result in more reliable outcomes.” In reply The School’s response to his report mentioned an October TURNITIN workshop which would facilitate inter-institutional first/second marking of dissertations. As yet, I have not had the opportunity to talks to staff about this, but it seems from the paper-work that I have seen that to date this has only been partially achieved. I would concur with my predecessor’s suggestion and encourage the team to revisit this matter for the next academic year.

EDUC 5901M Learning and Teaching in TESOL resubmissions – Assignment 1. A student was given a mark of 42% by the first marker, the final agreed mark was 48% of itself this is no necessarily a problem. However, it was unclear how or why this change was made as second marker comments were not made available to the student or to the external examiner. This suggests that some members of staff need to be made more fully aware of the second marking process and of the need for transparency.

EDUC 5994M Language Testing – reading the last two reports from my predecessor it is apparent that this module has been problematic in previous years. It is regrettable that problems persist and this suggests more robust measures may be needed to address concerns. Second marking/moderating does not follow standard sampling practices. Likewise feedback is less comprehensive than on other modules. Annotated comments are not used and this, I feel, makes it more difficult for students to get an informed sense of how their marks were arrived at and specific areas for suggested improvement.

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

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:

The academic standards of students were varied. There were some excellent submissions which demonstrated very good critical understanding of key concepts and issues, together with an ability to meaningfully reflect on and apply concepts to specified contexts. In contrast weaker students struggled with the content of our academic discourse community and with writing in English for academic purposes as a second language. Such problems are typical on many MA TESOL programmes which are delivered in the UK, so it is not surprising that they arise with this China-based programme.

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

See CPD suggestion in the final box below.

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?	N/A
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, June N, Nov
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>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

I am impressed by the structure and organisation of the course, together with the administrative efficiency and support that I have been given in my first year as external examiner. This is an excellent programme and is a credit to both institutions and to all the staff.

There are inherent challenges in managing and delivering a collaborative distance learning course and it is reassuring to note that this is recognised by the team who evidently work hard to address arising issues. From talking to Leeds-based staff and reading the last two reports from the previous external examiner it is clear that there is a willingness to address arising issues and deliver an excellent programme which is closely as closely aligned to the on-site Leeds version as possible, whilst at the same time also allowing for context-based divergences. This work is a process and as such needs to be seen as ongoing, with further work being needed. It is suggested that more and ongoing CPD sessions are needed on: TURNITIN-based marking and feedback perhaps using case studies and models of good practice from some of the modules; moderating systems and procedures; standardising assignment briefs and specifying what support is available to students within such briefs. Such CPD would, I feel, help reduce some of the issues raised in this and in previous reports. It is however recognised that human resource implications come with such suggestions and faculty staff are clearly already very busy.

To date I have not yet visited Guangdong which means that this first report is based entirely on a meeting with Leeds-based staff and on the “paper work” for the 2018-2019 academic year. I very much look forward to visiting the China campus in 2020 and to meeting staff and students, it is hoped that something of their voice can be included in my next report.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

TESOL

Programme(s) / Module(s):

EDUC5901M Learning and Teaching in TESOL
 EDUC5902M Investigating Language for TESOL
 EDUC5991M Approaches and Contexts in TESOL
 EDUC5992M Introduction to Second Language Acquisition
 EDUC5306M The Practice of Supporting Language Teacher Learning
 EDUC5909M Introducing a Task-Based Curriculum in Classrooms and Systems
 EDUC5925M Teacher Education for TESOL
 EDUC5935M Materials Development for TESOL
 EDUC5981M Teaching Languages to Young Learners
 EDUC5933M Language Teaching Methodology
 EDUC5993M Teaching Oral and Written Skills for TESOL
 EDUC5994M Language Testing
 EDUC5430M Dissertation

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

MA

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Programme Director for MA TESOL
 Programme Director for MA TESOL China

Faculty / School of:

FSS / EDUCATION

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 practice

We appreciate External Examiner's important suggestions. We will make sure that module guidelines are consistently clear in terms of the amount and nature of support available. This will be implemented from 2020/2021.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

NA

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:

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 impression about standard-related issues of the programme is very positive.

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 pleased to see the external examiner's positive evaluation of assessment and feedback of the programme. In response to the specific issues raised:

- a. We will ensure that all assignment briefs clearly specify the sources of support which are available to students. This could be partly addressed if all modules use the assessment template which has been distributed amongst module leaders. This is an important issue which must be addressed as soon as possible
- b. We will ensure that second markers comments are available to the external examiner. However, it is not our policy to share second marker's comments with students. It will be reiterated to all module leaders, tutors and markers to change the feedback comments accordingly if the agreed mark changes as a result of second marking.
- c. (programme leader for MA TESOL China) has written to , the module leader, passing on the EE's concerns. In reply, has agreed to state explicitly on the module assignment form that students can submit a 500-word plan by a certain date, and that they will receive feedback (oral or written) via Wechat, which is their preferred medium of communication. Regarding feedback using the new assessment criteria, has agreed to meet with Leeds staff to discuss these. I've also suggested that , and other dissertation markers meet with when is there in March/April to have another hands-on training session on TURNITIN.
- d. At the moment, the External Examiner, , is scheduled to visit GDUFS April 25-27th, to observe teaching and meet with academic staff. Obviously, this will need to be reviewed if the coronavirus crisis persists.
- e. We are still aiming to implement this exchange of marking, but it can only be done when Chinese colleagues can use TURNITIN. Following two workshops during 2018-19, colleagues were keen to use it but say that internet connections are still too unreliable, and they prefer to mark with paper. We hoped the migration of MINERVA to the Cloud in December might improve matters, though students report only a very minor change. When and are at GDUFS for the second teaching session (dates uncertain due to coronavirus) they will make renewed efforts to persuade Chinese colleagues to use TURNITIN.
- f. As programme leader of MA TESOL China, , did do some informal moderation of assessment: checked the TURNITIN reports for all 15 scripts marked by Chinese colleagues (as he also do for module assignments), and also skimmed a random selection of scripts to see whether marks appear to align with quality. did not have any concerns.

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 absolutely delighted that the external examiner believes that MA TESOL provision is of high standard and quality.

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 07/01/2020

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

EDUCATION

Subject(s):

TESOL

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MA Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)

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

MA

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 once again in the extremely high recruitment to the programme for 2018-9, both absolutely and in comparison with other PGT programmes in the sector.

On many modules very well staged progression through different assessment points enables 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 also widespread use of portfolio work in for assessing modules. This enables students to embed their theoretical knowledge in suitably 'applied' type of work, such as materials development or language analysis.

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 2018-9 saw second year of the implementation of a new and refreshed iteration of the MA TESOL programme, in which it was fully bedded down. The course team are to be commended with carrying out a radical review and consolidation of the programme in consultation with all 'stakeholders'. For the most part the new iteration of the programme worked well in Y1 (2017-8), and the few issues arising which related to course delivery in Y1 were thoroughly addressed, and for the most part resolved in Y2 (2018-2019).

Matters for Urgent Attention

If there are any areas which you think require urgent attention before the programme is offered again please note them in this box

None

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?	Yes
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	Yes
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?	Yes

I have been external examiner of the MA TESOL now for five years (2014-2019). In the middle of my term, the programme underwent a period of restructuring, and latterly the number of students has at least doubled, making it one of the largest UK programmes in its field. At each point of these seismic developments, the changes have been carried out systematically, and monitored and evaluated, in consultation with the staff team and myself as external examiner. A key aspect of this has been the regular and empathetic evaluation of the students experience on the programme. Not only is each module monitored, but the external examiners of the programme meet with the students biannually during examiners' visits. In this, I can attest that, against all odds, student satisfaction with the programme seemed to actually increase with the changes, which is a testament to the commitment of course tutors, module leaders, course leaders and of course the management team of the programme. I have been particularly impressed at the methodical way in which issues raised by external examiners and students are discussed in the five hour external examining days, and indeed examiners are given the opportunity for these issues to be discussed not only in relation to the MA TESOL but also in relation to the School as a whole. This has lead to one or two minor 'bugs' in the organisation of the courses to be factored over my period as examiner. A distinctive aspect of the programme is the opportunity that staff give to students to have preliminary drafts of their assessed coursework read (in part) so that they can develop steadily during their time on the programme. Very few other programmes in the field provide this opportunity to students; and I can attest that it is a feature of the programme which is hugely appreciated by the students that I have talked with over the years. However, in my view this places a substantial additional workload on individual members of staff. In this, I am not recommending that any change be made to this provision, but that the workload of staff should continue to be monitored, and that possibly some of the extra income which accrues to the School from the additional students numbers might beneficially be directed to enhance the resourcing of this activity, along with the other support services which academic staff provide selflessly on a day-to-day basis to their students. Another unique feature of the School and the programme has been the intensive five hour examining days, in which examiners of different programmes across the school have the opportunity to discuss and compare their experience of the courses which they are involved. This enables the School to achieve some consistency of provision across their PGT provision, which I am not aware of taking place elsewhere in the UK or internationally. Not least, this has enabled the School most recently to make some moves towards harmonising and enhancing the delivery of research methods courses for PGT programmes across the school. I also commend once again the remarkable efficiency and constancy of the programme administration through my five year term. This is headed up by _____ and meticulously executed on a day to day basis by _____, both of whom have brought remarkable commitment and skill to enabling the machinery of monitoring and evaluating the programme to be carried out with a minimum of strain on the part of examiners. Overall, I would attest that the MA TESOL at the Leeds School of Education over this period has in my opinion tangibly exceeded the standards of provision made by most of its competitors in the field and has given rise to remarkable levels of satisfaction across the student body.

Standards

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	Yes
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Yes
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Yes
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Yes
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Yes

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?	Yes
-----	---	-----

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 unwavering 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 sophisticated 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?	No
N/A		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	No
N/A		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	No
<i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i>		
N/A		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Yes
<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"> - As in previous years, all assignments tasks were well-conceived and the rubric well set out on assignment sheets, which were particularly well set out, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Excellent paperwork and proforma: o Well designed and clear proforma for marking o Tightly specified criteria for marking o Detailed grade sheets o Good presentation of course assignments o Well-designed assignment sheets - There was a good range of assessment tasks on the programme , including expository assignments, analytical assignments, and portfolios of pedagogic tasks and assessed presentations. - Assessment tasks were well designed in relation to the practical context of language teaching and learning. In this there was a very good attempt to contextualise the knowledge and skills which the students were learning on the programme. - On the whole there was very thoroughgoing feedback on assignments, and year on year this is becoming more consistent across modules. <p>The overall high level of student performance reflected a good quality of teaching and learning across all modules.</p>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Yes
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Yes

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:

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:

- ability to relate theory to academic practice;
- ability to understand assessment task and execute it;
- ability to analyse a data set;
- good academic skills.

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

The one weakness – as in previous years - was probably in 'critical thinking'. However, this is a perennial challenge for programmes of this type, 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 2018-9 cohort continued to improve on the 2017-8 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?	Yes
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Yes
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Yes
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Yes
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Yes
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Yes
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Yes
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Yes
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Yes
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Yes
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Yes
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Yes
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Yes
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Yes
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Yes
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Yes
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i> N/a</p>		

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 2018-9. 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 the MATESOL and the experience which they had on it. Despite the rapid increase in student numbers in the past two years, 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 programme tutors who support them on their modules. On one occasion I specifically addressed the issue of the diversity of the student body, and students reassured me that, rather to my surprise, they did not feel that the homogeneity of student body detracted from their academic experience.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Responder:	
Position*:	Programme Director for MA TESOL
Faculty / School of:	FSS
Address for communication:	School of Education University of Leeds Woodhouse Lane LS2 PJT
Email:	
Telephone:	

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

Completing the School response

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

Response to Points of innovation and/or good practice

We are delighted that recognition has been given to the quality of feedback provided for students. It is reassuring to see that the External Examiner thinks that there is a well-staged progression through different assessment points on many modules. We are absolutely pleased with the following comment: "The success of this [programme] may be reflected once again in the extremely high recruitment to the programme for 2018-19, both absolutely and in comparison with the other PGT programmes in the sector."

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

We are pleased that the External Examiner has commended the team for carrying out radical review and consolidation of the programme.

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:

We are pleased to see that the External Examiner acknowledges improvements in the programme over the period of appointment

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 responses to 'Standard-related' questions are very positive. The External Examiner has commended the programme for maintaining the links between theory and practice,

deployment of progressive assessment techniques, use of sophisticated VLE and the use of a varied range of teaching contexts to address the needs of students.

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 that the External Examiner has provided very positive comments about assessment and feedback. The External Examiner is pleased with assessment tasks, paperwork and proforma, marking procedures, grade sheets, and assignment sheets.

The Progression and Awards Process

Response to questions 20-35 (and related comments)

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

NA

Other comments

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

We are grateful to the External Examiner for giving recognition to the consistently high quality of the programme despite the rapid increase in student numbers.

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