

<b>ANNUAL EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT</b>
--

**Name of Institution Examined:** INTO UEA

**Faculty/School:** International Pre-Sessional English Programme

**Course Title(s):** Language and Study Skills Modules

**Academic Year:** 2019/20

**External Examiner Name:** Jane Sjoberg

**External Examiner's home University / College or Other Professional / Institutional Affiliation:** University of Birmingham

*NB – External Examiner reports are widely circulated, therefore students and staff should not be individually identified. Course Teams will respond to the recommendations made by the External Examiner in the boxes provided. The response should be counter signed by the Head of HE or equivalent within ten working days.*

An electronic copy of this report should be emailed to the Head of HE (or equivalent) at the partner institution, to arrive no later than one month after the main assessment board meeting. You will receive a copy of the report with the Course Team's response completed.

<b>Sufficient Evidence Checklist</b>
--------------------------------------

Please can you confirm the following:

<b>Programme materials</b>
----------------------------

Did you receive:	Y	N	N/A
a. Programme handbook(s)?	Y	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Programme regulations (these may be in the programme handbook)?	Y	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Module descriptions (these may be in the programme handbook)?	Y	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria?	Y	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Draft examination papers</b>
---------------------------------

a. (i) Did you receive all the draft papers?	Y	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ii) If not, was this at your request?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- b. (i) Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate? Y
- (ii) If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?
- c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments? Y

#### Marking examination scripts

- a. (i) Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts? Y
- (ii) If you did not receive all the scripts, was the method of selection satisfactory? Y
- b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate? Y
- c. Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks? Y

#### Dissertations/project reports

- a. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate?   N/a
- b. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?   N/a

#### Coursework/continuously assessed work

- a. Was sufficient coursework made available to you for assessment?   N/a
- b. Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?   N/a

#### Orals/performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements

- a. Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct orals and/or moderate performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements?   N/a

#### Final examiners' meeting

- a. Were you able to attend the meeting? Y
- b. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction? Y
- c. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners? Y

#### Maintaining Threshold Academic Standards

Please provide feedback on whether:

**The programme and its component parts are coherent with learning outcomes aligned with the relevant qualification descriptor and subject benchmark statements where applicable**

I was very impressed with the way adapted online INTO programmes and courses were designed and implemented at short notice due to COVID 19. The EAP programme specifications, course content and learning outcomes were established to ensure ample coverage of a range of academic study skills and core language that the students will need to deploy on their chosen course of study. Centralised core materials and content provided to all INTO centres was sensitively adapted and supplemented by the experienced INTO staff to guarantee a valuable learner experience that was tailored to the students progressing to UEA programmes.

**The programme reflects appropriate PSRB requirements where applicable**

N/a

**Assessments in modules of the same level are of a comparable standard to those in other UK HEIs**

Online assessment arrangements and assessed coursework are of a comparable standard with other pre-sessional programmes. Standards of marks and pass-rates are comparable with other pre-sessional programmes.

**The curriculum is current**

The centralised core curriculum was fully revised to create the new online programmes. Fixed content was sensitively adapted by teachers and tailored to meet the needs of their students. Course content and formative and summative assessments are regularly updated to reflect current developments and interests in broad academic areas of relevance to the different cohorts and to ensure that UKVI regulations on assessing proficiency in all four skills areas are met.

**Assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level**

The criteria provided realistically assesses at B2 (6.00 - 6.5 IELTS) level in line with UKVI requirements. As in the previous year, I recommend that criteria be expanded to allow for outlier results in certain areas. I am happy to accept that this work is in progress and was prevented by the need to implement centrally established INTO criteria due to the Covid situation. Formatively assessed work was used judiciously to inform teacher recommendations in the case of borderline students.

**Measuring Achievement, Rigour and Fairness**

Please provide feedback on whether:

**The types of assessment are appropriate for the subject, the students, the level of study and the expected outcomes**

This is a strength. Given the COVID 19 pandemic and necessary amendments to assessment, I commend the foresight of the programme manager in deciding to supplement externally conducted online assessments using Password with internal evaluations. This ensured that students were not unduly penalised for technical issues and resulted in a more rounded, realistic picture of each student's achievement in the case of INTO-UEA.

**The marking scheme/grading criteria have been properly and consistently applied, and internal marking is of an appropriate standard, fair and reliable**

Again a strength. Marking of online assessments using Password was automatic and centralised, ensuring consistency within and across INTO centres. Supplementary assessments were marked fairly and consistently. Feedback and marking of both drafts and final essays were thorough, with the fair and reliable application of marking criteria.

**The assessment processes are carried out in accordance with the institution's regulations and procedures**

I confirm that INTO UEA has made every effort ensure that assessment and any changes due to Covid 19 were in line with wider UEA regulations and procedures.

**Procedures governing mitigating/extenuating circumstances, academic integrity/misconduct and borderline performances have been considered fairly and equitably applying institutional regulations**

No mitigating/extenuating circumstances were presented. Work has been done to ensure that INTO's plagiarism processes are line with UEA processes and Turn-it-in has been used with greater consistency. Borderline cases were dealt with fairly and transparently. There was one instance of academic misconduct (essay mill) which was being investigated following university procedures.

### **Comparability of Standards and Student Performance**

**Reflecting on your experience at other institutions please provide feedback on:**

**The comparability of standards and student achievement:**

- **across the modules within a single programme**
- **across programmes within a single subject area in an awarding institution**
- **across programmes within a single subject area across institutions of which you have experience**
- **any of the above, across cohorts during your period of appointment**

Both preessional programmes saw comparably high levels of achievement with 8-week outliers explained by non-submission. Student achievement and pass-rates are comparable with preessional programmes of similar length in other institutions with which I am familiar.

### **Enhancement of Quality**

**Please provide comment and recommendations on:**

**Good practice and innovation relating to learning, teaching and assessment you have observed**

Excellent levels of feedback and consistency. The use of the previous year's reading and listening tests was an appropriate decision to make, given the lack of opportunity to trial new assessments. This will necessitate the creation of new tests for the following year.

As previously observed, INTO teachers make every effort to ensure that teaching and content are adapted for each cohort of students, with care to consider the likely interests and academic needs of students going on to specific programmes. In this way the core programme uses a general EAP approach with ESAP elements where required.

**Opportunities to enhance the quality of the learning opportunities provided to students**

The online learning platform was used well to ensure student-student interaction and teacher support. Portfolio-style work was continued in the form of reading and listening logs which then informed teacher's evaluations e.g. in the case of borderline grades.

**Also, please:**

**State whether you received sufficient evidence to enable your role to be fulfilled. If not, please provide details**

Yes. Thank you very much for ensuring that I had everything I required, that my queries were all addressed and for making my experience a pleasant one in what has been a stressful time for all. It would have been nice to have arranged an online chat with teachers and some students but this year my own circumstances made this challenging to arrange.

**State whether issues raised in the previous report(s) have been, or are being, addressed to your satisfaction**

Work is ongoing for criteria development. I found that the way results were presented was simpler than in previous years (where a band of CEFR and IELTS grades was used). However, results still required unpicking a little (i.e. the percentage equivalents for IELTS grades). It would perhaps be helpful in future years to have more information about the way in which these are calculated before the results are published.

This year due to Covid 19, assessments were moderated satisfactorily by two senior members of staff; however, internal assessments were not double marked. This was because these assessments were initially intended as a 'check' rather than forming the basis of official grades. As UEA requested internal grades as being a more reliable assessment of student achievement (which I am inclined to agree with), second marking had not been deemed necessary. For future exams it is important that this takes place in line with INTO examination guidelines.

**Use this space to address any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body**

N/a

**Give an overview of your term of office if this is your final year**

N/A

## RECOMMENDATIONS, RESPONSE AND ACTION PLAN

Please list your recommendations for action by the course team:

<b>External Examiner's Recommendations for action</b> <i>(to be completed by External Examiner)</i>	<b>Course Team's Response (action to be taken and measurable outcomes)</b> <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i>	<b>By whom</b> <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i>	<b>By when</b> <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i>	<b>Progress as of February 20__</b> <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i>	<b>Progress as of end of Year</b> <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i>
Continue work on updating criteria to allow for a broader spectrum of marks above and below B2.	This has started and will be completed by Spring 2021	Rosalind Boote	May 2021		
Please provide details of the outcome of the academic misconduct issue raised.	The student was given the opportunity to make an academic appeal against his grade, but this was not taken up by the student.	AST			
If appropriate, consider continuing the simplified (non-CEFR - IELTS and percentages only) approach used this year.	The PSE Coordinator and I will discuss and review the reporting of results for all courses.	Rosalind Boote David Boyce	May 2021		
Please provide information before results are published as to how the results will be recorded and how percentage equivalents are calculated.	As we used the same tests as last year, I assumed the EE still had this information. Next year this will be	Rosalind Boote AST	By August 2021		

	sent with all the other PSE information in good time.				
--	---	--	--	--	--

**Report completed by:**

**Signature**

Jane Sjoberg

Date: 15 September 2020



## COURSE TEAM'S GENERAL RESPONSE TO THE REPORT

The comments in the report are exacting and fair. We were pleased that the EE praised the teachers for the good level of feedback and consistent marking.

The appropriacy and quality of content of the course commended which was especially pleasing given the time we had to author and build the online programme.

The EE recommendations were fair, appropriate and achievable, all of which will enhance the course for 2021.

### Responses and Action Plan completed by:

Course Leader:

Date: 21/10/20

Rosalind Boote

*(Please print name and sign)*

### Countersigned by:

Head of HE (or  
equivalent)

Date:

Jeremy Moyle

02/11/20

### MID-YEAR REVIEW OF ACTIONS (FEBRUARY 20 )

#### To be completed by Course Leader:

Mid-Year Review of Actions Completed:	Signature:	Date:
External Examiner Notified:	Signature:	Date:


### YEAR END REVIEW OF ACTIONS (MONTH 20 )

#### To be completed by Course Leader:


Year End Review of Actions Completed:	Signature:	Date:
External Examiner Notified:	Signature:	Date:

#### To be completed by the Academic Partnerships:

A	No action identified	
---	----------------------	--

B	Identified action and picked up appropriately	X
C	Identified action and not picked up appropriately or action not identified	
<p>Hannah Jackson  Assistant Head of Partnerships</p>  <p>3 November 2020</p>		

**To be completed by Academic Director of Partnerships:**

A	No action identified	
B	Identified action and picked up appropriately	X
C	Identified action and not picked up appropriately or action not identified	
<p>Professor Zoe Butterfint  Academic Director of Partnerships</p>  <p>9 November 2020</p>		

**DOCUMENT OWNER:** Academic Partnerships

**DOCUMENT TYPE:** Form

**APPROVED BY:** Academic Partnerships

**VERSION NUMBER:** 2

**DUE FOR REVIEW:** June 2020

**VERSION LOG:**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Version no.</b>	<b>Summary of changes</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Approved by</b>
May 2019	2	Updated to include table for mid-year review of action plan	Academic Partnerships	Academic Partnerships