1. Degree Programmes Reviewed
   - BA Linguistics
   - BA Linguistics and Clinical Language Studies
   - BA Applied English Language Studies
   - BA English and Modern English Language
   - BA Philosophy and Linguistics
   - BA Psychology and Linguistics
   - BA Typography and Linguistics
   - BA Linguistics with French, or German, or Italian
   - BA Linguistics with Japanese
   - BA French and Linguistics
   - BA German and Linguistics
   - BA Italian and Linguistics
   - BSc Speech and Language Therapy
   - MA Applied Linguistics
   - MA English Language Teaching
   - MA Contemporary English Language and Linguistics
   - MA Linguistics
   - MA Linguistics Research (Applied Linguistics, Linguistics and Clinical Linguistics pathways)
   - MA English Language Teaching (Distance Learning)
   - MSc Speech and Language Therapy

2. The Periodic Review took place on 1 and 2 December 2003.

3. Objectives of the Periodic Review

   The objectives of the Periodic Review were to:
   - Monitor the quality and standards of the degree programmes under review
   - Enable the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies to evaluate its taught programme provision, particularly student achievement of the appropriate academic standards, and the learning opportunities offered to students
   - To enable an independent Panel to review this self-evaluation through consideration of documentation and discussions with staff and students
   - Provide a means by which the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies was able to reflect on the success, development and possible improvement of its taught programmes
   - Ask fundamental questions about the rationale, structure and resourcing of the programmes under review
   - Consider the educational aims and objectives of the programmes
   - Review teaching, learning and methods of assessment in their contexts
   - Consider whether the programmes under review should continue to run for a further period of up to six years
4. Conduct of the Periodic Review

The Periodic Review was conducted by a Panel chaired by the Sub-Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, and also comprising two internal members of academic staff (neither from the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies), and two external academic members specialising in Linguistics and Applied Language Studies.

The Panel received a range of documentation in advance of the Review, including a Self-Evaluation Document prepared by the Department and also relevant programme specifications. During the Review Visit, the Panel considered other documentation and met with relevant staff from the School. Members of the Panel also met with current students studying on the undergraduate and postgraduate degree programmes under review, and were given a guided tour of the facilities.

5. Evidence Base

In addition to the meetings held with staff and students, the Panel considered a wide range of evidence, including examples of student work with staff feedback, copies of programme handbooks, minutes of relevant committees and statistical data. The Panel was able to see External Examiners reports for the three previous years.

6. External peer contributors to the process

The external members of the Review Panel were present for the duration of the Periodic Review. The Faculty Board for Arts and Humanities appointed the external members, after considering nominations from the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies. The role of these external members was to provide subject expertise and judgement of the validity and appropriateness of the programmes under review.

7. Overview of the main characteristics of the programmes covered by the review

The Panel considered that the School could be deemed to provide innovative and challenging courses in its field, and had an international reputation of which it could be proud. Students who are currently on the degrees provided very positive feedback regarding their experience of the programmes.

All the programmes under review comply with the relevant Subject Benchmark Statements (Speech & Language Therapy and Linguistics). In addition the BSc and MSc Speech and Language Therapy programmes meet the educational requirements of the lead professional body in the field, the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists.

8. Conclusions on innovation and good practice

Examples of good practice identified included:

- The high quality of documentation provided to both staff and students in the form of handbooks and course materials
- Excellent pastoral support offered to students, contributing to the School’s good student retention rate
The use of Virtual Learning Environments on all programmes offered by the School and innovation in teaching methods more generally

The use of ‘Task Criteria’ in the assessment of assignments

9. Conclusions on quality and standards

The Review Panel concluded that:

- The academic standards of the programmes were being met, and all programmes were of a high quality, despite the structural complexity of some. Students were aware of what was expected of them, understood the structure and content of the programmes, and were given good support in making module choices

- The assessment regime was appropriate and suitable to meet the aims and outcomes of the programmes

- Teaching and learning methods and resources were used in ways that should help students achieve the intended learning outcomes, and the widespread use of Virtual Learning Environments was particularly positive

- The School had well-established procedures for monitoring and reviewing quality management matters, and student progression and examination results and External Examiners’ reports indicated that there were few problems with quality management

10. Conclusions on currency and validity of programmes under review

The Review Panel concluded that the programmes under review remained current and valid and recommended that all programmes be re-approved to run for a further six years.

11. Summary of recommendations

The Review Panel recommended that:

- The School seek to identify professional as well as academic aims and outcomes in programme documentation where appropriate

- The School Teaching and Learning Committee review the number of module options to ensure that students on all programmes had sufficient choice

- The School make written responses to External Examiners Reports in line with University guidelines

- A means of ensuring that postgraduate students were informed of progress in the early part of their study be identified

- The form on which feedback to students on assignments was recorded be amended to allow an indication of how the work might have been approved
• Appropriate selection and training procedures be used in the appointment of Teaching Assistants

• The School consider amending Student Module Evaluation forms to allow students not to record their degree programme in order to protect the anonymity of students on smaller programmes

• A means of publicising the outcomes of Student Evaluations and Staff/Student Committee meetings be developed.

12. Summary of actions taken in response to the Review

• The aims and outcomes of professionally related programmes are being revised in programme documentation

• The School has maximised the availability of options and standardised core modules across programmes

• Programme Directors have been reminded of the need to respond to External Examiners’ Reports as soon as possible after receipt

• From October 2004 more opportunities will be introduced for formal feedback to postgraduate students in the first term of study

• An amendment is being made to the feedback form

• The School has introduced a new evaluation mechanism early in the Autumn Term to identify and address teaching issues for Teaching Assistants, who will have been carefully chosen and trained in relation to pre-existing knowledge and skills

• A revised module evaluation form excludes specific reference to degree programme

• Student/staff committee minutes are published on the School website and an item on the agenda of these committees will provide for reporting outcomes of student evaluations