

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

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2012– 2013

Part A: General Information**Subject area and awards being examined**

Faculty / School of:	Education
Subject(s):	<i>English</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	PGCE Secondary
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	PGCE/PgCE/Postgraduate Certificate in Education Studies

Completed report

The completed report should be attached to an e-mail and sent as soon as possible, and no later than six weeks after the relevant meeting of the Board of Examiners, to exexadmin@leeds.ac.uk.

Alternatively you can post your report to: **Head of Academic Quality and Standards**
Academic Quality and Standards Team
Room 12:81, EC Stoner Building
The University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT

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

. No urgent matters.

Only applicable in first year of appointment

Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?

n/a

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

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

1. Please indicate the extent to which the programme Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) were commensurate with the level of the award

- *The appropriateness of the Intended Learning Outcomes for the programme(s)/modules and of the structure and content of the programme(s);*
- *The extent to which standards are appropriate for the award or award element under consideration.*

The learning outcomes are all appropriate for a PGCE course, as are the standards required for awards at Postgraduate and Professional Graduate levels.

2. Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?

- *The comparability of the programme(s) with similar programme(s) at other institutions and against national benchmarks and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications.*

The programme is comparable with other programmes at these levels (6 and 7) and more specifically with other secondary PGCE programmes.

3. Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs

- *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.*

Assessment methods are appropriate to the course and to the ILOs

4. Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the Aims and ILOs?

- *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.*

In their academic writing and in their professional practice, students on the course represent the range of attainment that is to be found on other PGCE courses: the best are genuinely outstanding and all showed a real commitment to the sustained development of their practice.

5. For Examiners responsible for programmes that include clinical practice components, please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum

n/a

6. Please comment on the nature and effectiveness of enhancements to the programme(s) and modules since the previous year

It would be particularly helpful if you could also identify areas of good practice which are worthy of wider dissemination.

The most significant change to the programme this year has been the full implementation of an e-profile system.

Among students, their school mentors and their university tutors, there seemed to be a general acknowledgement:

(i) that the use of e-profiles had potential benefits for all parties;

(ii) that the teething troubles associated with the introduction were the cause of significant frustration. Students reported the irritation of spending sessions with their mentors attempting to upload evidence and then finding that the evidence had vanished without trace. A mentor, who was clearly well-disposed towards the idea of e-profiling, described the system as 'very clunky' and said: 'it takes a lot of clicks to get anywhere in it.'

As I have suggested, these may well be nothing more than the problems associated with an initial phase of implementation – problems that were encapsulated by students' uncertainties as to 'what goes where'. A rather more significant issue, which emerged in conversation with a focus group of students, was that of ownership – an issue not of 'what goes where' but rather of *what it is for*. The students tended to regard the e-profiles as merely an instrument of an assessment process, conducted on them by others.

If the e-profiles are to fulfil their potential, this issue needs to be addressed. In part, this may be a matter of presentation: students need to be encouraged to take ownership of their own profiles, to see the construction of the e-profiles as a process in which they are actively engaged, a process that in itself can contribute powerfully to their professional development and a process that should enable them to reflect constructively on their progress as teachers.

The students to whom I spoke understood that they would have no access to their own profiles once they had completed the PGCE course. If this is indeed the case, this does impose an unfortunate limitation on the profiles – and makes it harder to convince the students that they have ownership over their own profile. If it were possible to provide students with continuing access to the e-profile, it could then become a valuable instrument of ongoing professional development and emphasise the continuity between ITE and CPD.

7. Please comment on the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching

This may include examples of curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research.

All three M-level assignments require students to investigate local policy and practice, including their own practice as classroom teachers, and to consider such practice in the light of their reading of theory and published research. One of the challenges for any M-level PGCE course is to induct students into research methodologies and frameworks within the context of what, necessarily, must remain a course of practice-based professional training. Generally speaking, the course meets this challenge successfully. Last year, I expressed some doubts about the third and final assignment being presented as a piece of action research. These doubts remain.

For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements

8. If you have acted as a mentor to a new External Examiner or have received mentor support please comment here on the arrangements

n/a

The Examination/Assessment Process

9. The University and its Schools provide guidance for External Examiners as to their roles, powers and responsibilities. Please indicate whether this material was sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner.

- *Whether External Examiners have sufficient access to the material needed to make the required judgements and whether they are encouraged to request additional information.*

Appropriate material was made available to me – in a thoroughly efficient manner.

10. Did you receive appropriate documentation relating to the programmes and/or parts of programmes for which you have responsibility, e.g. programme specifications or module handbooks, marking criteria?

- *The coherence of the policies and procedures relating to External Examiners and whether they match the explicit roles they are asked to perform.*

Appropriate documentation was received.

It was also helpful, this year, to have access to the students' e-portfolios.

The schedule of visits was clear and helpful.

11. Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments? Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate? If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

n/a

12. Was sufficient assessed / examined work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work? Were the scripts clearly marked/annotated?

Yes.

As was the case last year, tutors' responses to students' work were admirably detailed.

13. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate? Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

n/a

14. Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Board of Examiners? Were you able to attend the meeting? Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board?

I regret that I was not able to attend the Board this year, since it clashed with the last day of my own PGCE course in London.

15. Were appropriate procedures in place to give due consideration to mitigating circumstances and medical evidence?

n/a

Other comments

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

Partnership arrangements and the quality of mentoring

In my visits to schools, I spoke with subject mentors, ITT coordinators and a Training School manager as well as with student teachers. School-based colleagues were fully committed to working in partnership with the University. They spoke appreciatively of the University's administrative arrangements, the speed, efficiency and timeliness of communication processes and also of the University's readiness to be proactive in developing new working relationships with schools. They were honest about the uncertain landscape of Initial Teacher Education more generally: in this context – a context described as 'chaotic' by one ITT coordinator – the confidence that they expressed in the University should be taken as a wholehearted endorsement of the University's role in ITE.

What was also striking was the strength of school-based colleagues' commitment to the collaborative process of teacher education. This ethos of a principled engagement in professional development was expressed in conversation with me; it was also demonstrated in the feedback given by mentors to their student teachers. All of the post-lesson debriefing sessions that I observed provided evidence of high-quality mentoring in practice. The feedback that was provided was detailed, thorough, attentive to the student teacher's strengths and rooted in a shared knowledge of the class and of individual students within it.

Also noteworthy was the marked degree of continuity in the partnership. A number of the mentors are fairly recent graduates of the Leeds PGCE programme and there is a real sense of a community of practice centring on the University. It is to be hoped that this survives the current turbulence in the provision of initial teacher education.

30 October, 2013

<>

Dear <>

We are very grateful to you for your helpful and supportive report. Your insightful comments will be considered and discussed by colleagues in some detail and will lead, I am sure, to enhanced PGCE provision not just in English but across our Secondary PGCE provision .

We were delighted with your very encouraging observations on a number of dimensions of the course: the efficiency of our administrative arrangements; the attainment of our best students and their commitment to their professional development; tutors' detailed feedback on written assignments; high quality school-based mentoring; our readiness and proactivity in developing new relationships with schools; the effectiveness of our communication with schools; the confidence school-based colleagues have in the University and their commitment to collaborate in ITE; "a real sense of community of practice centring on the University.

We are also grateful for your observations and recommendations relating to the first year of implementation of the new eProfile. We value your reporting of the general appreciation of its benefits for all parties. We were aware of the problematic issues as a result of ongoing monitoring and requests for feedback from all stakeholders including student teachers, mentors, ITE Co-ordinators and Personal Tutors. Issues which could be addressed in-house were dealt with as they arose. Issues beyond our competence, e.g. the tool's 'clunkiness' were forwarded to Paragon, the company which constructs the eProfile and, in the majority of cases, they corrected the faults efficiently. In terms of students' uncertainties about 'what goes where', we are in the process of pre-populating sections of the eProfile with named folders, so that the designated location for particular items is absolutely clear.

Students' apparent uncertainty about 'what it is for' is very disappointing. Throughout the course, students were reminded about this in EPS lectures, personal tutorials and in writing (see various documents in the "Useful documents/templates" section of the eProfile). This was often in the context of explaining to the students that it was important for the monitoring function of the eProfile, for their own time-management and limiting of stress, that they did not leave the uploading of material until the end of the Placement but rather should deal with this on a regular and frequent basis. A message given constantly to the students was that the eProfile was theirs, their responsibility, their evidence-base for the meeting of the Standards. Nonetheless, it is clear from the students to whom you spoke that this message did not get across clearly. The handbooks for 2013-14 (including the new Mentor Handbook) contain much more information about the eProfile, its purpose and how it should be used. This will be supplemented by eProfile specific EPS sessions as

well as more hands-on training sessions for students, mentors and personal tutors. Again, we are very disappointed that your sample of students thought that access to their eProfiles would cease at the end of the course. This is a misunderstanding. They have access to the eProfiles throughout their teaching careers, for the very sound reasons you summarise in your report. This is another message was given to students but seemingly not clearly enough. This has been addressed in the new edition of the handbooks and will be supplemented orally, as appropriate.

We are grateful for your positive comments on our addressing of the challenge of inducting students into research methodologies and frameworks. In relation to the doubts you expressed in your previous report about the final assessment being presented as a piece of action research, we were unable to address these in time for 2012-13, as assessment arrangements had already been put in place and published in the handbooks by the outgoing Head of Secondary PGCE. For 2013-14, however, references to action research have been removed and have been replaced by 'school-based, small scale research'.

We appreciate very much the time, effort and consideration you have given not only to this extremely helpful report but also to your very positive contribution during the course of your visit in May.

With sincere thanks and best wishes.

Yours sincerely

<>

Head of School of Education

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR: 2012– 2013

Part A: General Information**Subject area and awards being examined**

Faculty / School of:	School of Education
Subject(s):	Biology Physics and Chemistry
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Post Graduate Certificate in Education with QTS Professional Certificate in Education with QTS
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	Post Graduate Certificate in Education with QTS Professional Certificate in Education with QTS

Completed report

The completed report should be attached to an e-mail and sent as soon as possible, and no later than six weeks after the relevant meeting of the Board of Examiners, to exexadmin@leeds.ac.uk.

Alternatively you can post your report to: **Head of Academic Quality and Standards**
Academic Quality and Standards Team
Room 12:81, EC Stoner Building
The University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT

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

n/a

Only applicable in first year of appointment

Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

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

There have been many subtle changes to the programme over the last four years, in part due to the changing nature of teacher education and in part due to reflection by the course team and evaluation of student experiences. There is a much clearer action planning with realistic outcomes and times, which has given greater cohesion across the subjects. There is parity between the generic and subject elements of the course in terms of positive student comments and outcomes. The assignments are now more embedding within the course and the timing of submission and feedback are much improved. There has been a move to electronic portfolios in more recent years. It has been a privilege to work with the School of Education over the past four years and hope it will continue to embrace the changes with the same professionalism.

Standards

1. Please indicate the extent to which the programme Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) were commensurate with the level of the award

- *The appropriateness of the Intended Learning Outcomes for the programme(s)/modules and of the structure and content of the programme(s);*
- *The extent to which standards are appropriate for the award or award element under consideration.*

As previously I had the opportunity to read a wide range of assignments, observe the students of their professional teaching placements and discuss the course with them and also at the end of the programme. I was also able to engage with the programme documentation. From all of these activities I can confirm that the Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes of the Programme continue to be appropriate for a Post Graduate Certificate in Education, particularly in light of the new professional standards that have been introduced. The course continues to be rigorous ensuring that the students are able to meet the professional standards for Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) whilst challenging them to engage critically with both theory and practice to meet the additional master's level learning outcomes. I also can confirm that this cohort of students are aware of the Aims and Learning Outcomes and feel supported to meet them.

2. Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?

- *The comparability of the programme(s) with similar programme(s) at other institutions and against national benchmarks and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications.*

I can confirm that these Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes are comparable with other institutions that offer PGCEs with QTS at this level and that they meet the requirements set by the The National College for Teaching and Leadership for awards in 2013. I can also confirm that the assignments for the award of master's credits are also comparable with other institutions that offer these credits as part of the postgraduate certificate in education.

This is confirmed through their assessment requirements –both written assignments and also professional teaching practice activities.

3. Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs

- *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 assignments are rigorous and enable the students to demonstrate a range of marks. The topic areas were seen as useful in enabling them to reflect well on their teaching and to consider how to move forwards and how engaging with research helped them improve their practice. One aspect that the team may want to consider is the timing of the second EPS assignment which they felt left them little time in their new school to complete sufficient research.

The feedback given was helpful and some of it was of an excellent standard. There was clear evidence of second marking and there was no discrepancy between markers. The mark scheme gives a clear structure both for the students and the markers.

The professional aspect of the course is assessed through the use of electronic portfolios and the students did mention the 'clunkiness' of this system but were aware that this is a new requirement and they were on the whole supportive of this change. Further refinements of the system should ameliorate these issues for next year.

4. Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the Aims and ILOs?

- *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 assignments gave the students the opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the Aims and ILOs of the course there were some excellent examples of well researched and critically evaluated assignments which were graded highly, whilst there are still students who did find aspects of the assignments challenging. The opportunity to progress either with the postgraduate or professional certificate enables all students to achieve at some level. The students whose assignments were moderated were comparable to those in other institutions.

The professional aspect of the course was verified by observing them teach. Again the standards of the lesson taught are comparable with similar students in other institutions. This was further confirmed by the school based mentors who work with other providers. Again the opportunity to complete without gaining QTS enables the students to achieve at some level.

Again as with previous years the students indicated that they felt supported by their tutors and particularly mentioned their personal tutors. All the students spoken to felt they had been well supported by their school based subject mentors.

5. For Examiners responsible for programmes that include clinical practice components, please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum

n/a

6. Please comment on the nature and effectiveness of enhancements to the programme(s) and modules since the previous year

It would be particularly helpful if you could also identify areas of good practice which are worthy of wider dissemination.

The students particularly mentioned the transition weeks at the end of the course especially those that had two separate activities. They felt this had been a really useful addition to the course.

7. Please comment on the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching

This may include examples of curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research.

There was clear evidence again from the student assignments that there was an engagement with research with both generic teaching and their own subject specialism. This underpinned both of the master's level assignments and from reading these it was clear that this engagement with research was also impacting on their professional practice in school.

For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements

8. If you have acted as a mentor to a new External Examiner or have received mentor support please comment here on the arrangements

n/a

The Examination/Assessment Process

9. The University and its Schools provide guidance for External Examiners as to their roles, powers and responsibilities. Please indicate whether this material was sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner.

- *Whether External Examiners have sufficient access to the material needed to make the required judgements and whether they are encouraged to request additional information.*

Yes the information given was sufficient to carry out this role and requests for additional information were quickly responded to.

10. Did you receive appropriate documentation relating to the programmes and/or parts of programmes for which you have responsibility, e.g. programme specifications or module handbooks, marking criteria?

- *The coherence of the policies and procedures relating to External Examiners and whether they match the explicit roles they are asked to perform.*

These were available as required.

11. Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments? Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate? If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

n/a

12. Was sufficient assessed / examined work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work? Were the scripts clearly marked/annotated?

Yes as previously there were a wide range of each of the written assessments that were available to ensure the rigorous marking and second marking had occurred, together with the statistical data for each assignment. This included Physics, Chemistry and Biology. This year they were electronically sent so we only saw the unmarked scripts. There was a range of assignments at all grades. We also were able to have access to the electronic profiles of named students to assess their files. This was more complex than previously looking through paper files but am confident this will become easier with adjustments as the students, tutors and external examiners become more confident with this way of collating evidence against the standards.

13. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate? Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

n/a

14. Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Board of Examiners? Were you able to attend the meeting? Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board?

The administrative arrangements were satisfactory for the main Board. I was satisfied with the recommendations by the Board.

15. Were appropriate procedures in place to give due consideration to mitigating circumstances and medical evidence?

n/a

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

The students continue to praise the course and the Physics, Biology and Chemistry students particularly commented on the excellent subject sessions they had which enabled them to confidently approach their teaching placements. They particularly commented on the sharing of their experiences, the A level teaching support and micro teach aspects of the course. They also welcome the personal tutor role. The mentors in schools were also positive about the course and felt that the students were well prepared for their teaching. They also commented positively on the mentor training.

As this is my final year as external I would like to comment on the very enjoyable experience I have had as external examiner. It has been good to hear the positive comments from the students and the school based mentors. I have been pleased to see improvements to the course and that issues raised by students have been addressed over the years. I would also like to comment on the excellent support from the Administration Team at Hilary Place as well as the course leaders and tutors. I do wish the course every success especially in light of current changes to teacher education.

31 October 2013

<>

Dear <>

We are very grateful to you for your helpful and supportive report. Your insightful comments will be considered and discussed by colleagues in some detail and will lead, I am sure, to enhanced PGCE provision not just in science but across our Secondary PGCE provision .

We were delighted with your very encouraging observations on a number of dimensions of the course: the rigour and level of challenge which permeate the course; students' positive feedback on the totality of the course and on science sessions in particular; mentors' positive feedback on the course and on the training we give them; the improved embedding of the assignments in the course, their timing and the feedback provided; the excellence of some of the assignments submitted by students; students' engagement with research and the positive impact this had on their school-based practice; the support provided by the personal tutors and mentors; the students' appreciation of the value of the 'transition weeks'; the increased clarity in action planning; the strength of our administrative support.

We are also very grateful for your identification of areas which would benefit from some attention and your helpful recommendations for improvement.

The first year of implementation of the new eProfile has been challenging for students, tutors and mentors. We were aware of the problematic issues as a result of ongoing monitoring and requests for feedback from all parties. Issues which could be addressed in-house were dealt with as they arose. Issues beyond our competence were forwarded to Paragon, the company which constructs the eProfile and, in the majority of cases, they corrected the faults efficiently. Guidelines are already in place which should prove helpful in obviating the 2012-13 problems. The handbooks for 2013-14 (including the new Mentor Handbook) contain much more information about the eProfile, its purpose and how it should be used. This includes specific dates on which the eProfile should be checked by mentors and personal tutors and a document where it has to be confirmed that checking has taken place. This will be supplemented by eProfile specific EPS sessions as well as more hands-on training sessions for students, mentors and personal tutors.

We recognise the challenge the students face in meeting the research demands of the second EPS assignment, given the timing of the submission deadline. We will certainly give very careful consideration to how we might address this issue to allow students the best possible opportunity to meet the assignment requirements to the best of their ability.

We appreciate very much the time, effort and consideration you have given not only to this extremely helpful report but also to your very positive contribution during the course of your visit in May.

We very much regret that your term of office as our External Examiner for Science has now come to an end. You have played a major role in the year on year improvement of our provision and have always provided constructive criticism in a most sensitive and understanding manner. We are deeply grateful to you for your support and collegiality.

With sincere thanks and best wishes

Yours sincerely

<>

Head of School of Education

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2012– 2013

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	Education
Subject(s):	<i>Secondary Maths</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	PGCE

Completed report

The completed report should be attached to an e-mail and sent as soon as possible, and no later than six weeks after the relevant meeting of the Board of Examiners, to exexadmin@leeds.ac.uk.

Alternatively you can post your report to: **Head of Academic Quality and Standards**
 Academic Quality and Standards Team
 Room 12:81, EC Stoner Building
 The University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT

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

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

Only applicable in first year of appointment

Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

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

1. Please indicate the extent to which the programme Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) were commensurate with the level of the award

- *The appropriateness of the Intended Learning Outcomes for the programme(s)/modules and of the structure and content of the programme(s);*
- *The extent to which standards are appropriate for the award or award element under consideration.*

I have had the opportunity to visit three partnership schools to observe four trainees teach. In all three schools I met briefly with the school mentor and/or class teacher spoke with the student-teachers after the lesson observation. I have also read a sample of assignments. On this basis I would say that the academic standards set by the University are appropriate for the award being studied.

2. Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?

- *The comparability of the programme(s) with similar programme(s) at other institutions and against national benchmarks and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications.*

The aims and the ILOs resemble those of other universities offering similar programmes.

3. Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs

- *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 assessments of the maths student-teachers, demonstrated through the sample of assignments, are comparable to student-teachers on PGCE courses at other universities. The assignments showed the expected range of attainment. It was clear that most students were able to critically analyse their practice and identify areas for development. The assignments demonstrated that the students' practice was rooted in theory. The very good assignments drew on a range of readings, both from texts and journals, and the readings were generally correctly referenced. The student-teacher I observed in school demonstrated that their performance was in-line with student-teachers on comparable courses.

4. Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the Aims and ILOs?

- *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 student-teachers I met with at University were articulate, enthusiastic about the course and about Maths teaching. It is clear that all the student-teachers are able to plan lessons carefully and thoroughly taking account of individual pupils' needs. The assignments showed that the students could critically evaluate and reflect on their practice. The student-teachers I observed teach in school were meeting the Standards for the award of Qualified Teacher Status. The student-teachers also demonstrated good subject knowledge through the lesson. I was able to go through and discuss the student's files before and after the lesson. This student showed careful record keeping. From discussions with the student-teachers and by looking at files it was noticeable that some students were very clear about how the Standards were evidenced. The students demonstrated enthusiasm during their teaching and were very happy with the support they had received.

5. For Examiners responsible for programmes that include clinical practice components, please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum

6. Please comment on the nature and effectiveness of enhancements to the programme(s) and modules since the previous year

It would be particularly helpful if you could also identify areas of good practice which are worthy of wider dissemination.

The move towards having a more comprehensive E-profile has a lot of potential to allow all interested parties to be aware of the progress of the individual student at any given time. This can inform the practice of the school mentors and the University tutor. It would be useful to continue to make the student interaction and the school teacher interaction with the software more user friendly.

7. Please comment on the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching

This may include examples of curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research.

It is pleasing to note that the PGCE Tutor has been actively encouraged to do a PhD and has been allocated time for it. This inevitably leads in the University sessions to references being made to research that the tutor has had exposure to. I would encourage the tutor to continue with this and for the university to support the tutor in this endeavour. In terms of the students it is clear that they have engaged with the research for the purpose of the assignments that they have submitted. In terms of the discussions that I had with the students after the observations of their lessons, it was clear that some were

able to draw on the research that had informed their practice. I felt that there was some improvement on this from last year.

For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements

8. If you have acted as a mentor to a new External Examiner or have received mentor support please comment here on the arrangements

The Examination/Assessment Process

9. The University and its Schools provide guidance for External Examiners as to their roles, powers and responsibilities. Please indicate whether this material was sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner.

- *Whether External Examiners have sufficient access to the material needed to make the required judgements and whether they are encouraged to request additional information.*

Yes

10. Did you receive appropriate documentation relating to the programmes and/or parts of programmes for which you have responsibility, e.g. programme specifications or module handbooks, marking criteria?

- *The coherence of the policies and procedures relating to External Examiners and whether they match the explicit roles they are asked to perform.*

Yes

11. Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments? Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate? If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

Yes

12. Was sufficient assessed / examined work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work? Were the scripts clearly marked/annotated?

Yes

13. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate? Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

The choice of topic for students to consider for the dissertation was good in making the students reflect on their teaching.

14. Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Board of Examiners? Were you able to attend the meeting? Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board?

The Board of Examiners was administered efficiently and effectively.

15. Were appropriate procedures in place to give due consideration to mitigating circumstances and medical evidence?

In the handful of cases appropriate consideration seemed to have been given to the circumstances of students.

Other comments

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

13 November 2013

Dear

We are very grateful to you for your helpful and supportive report. Your insightful comments will be considered and discussed by colleagues in some detail and will lead, I am sure, to enhanced PGCE provision not just in mathematics but across our Secondary PGCE provision .

We were delighted with your very encouraging observations on a number of dimensions of the course: students' ability to analyse their practice critically and identify areas for development; the high quality of the very good assignments and the engagement with research which these included, which had, in turn, informed teaching practice; the enthusiasm which students demonstrated for their subject and for teaching; their careful record keeping; their positive feedback on the support they had received. We were also pleased to note the very positive impact which the mathematics tutor's PhD research had on the students' learning. The School of Education will certainly continue to support doctoral study.

Your comments on the eProfile combine the positive with a dimension which merits our attention. You see the potential of this new monitoring tool to allow mentors and personal tutors to review a student's progress at any time and from any location where access to the internet is available. You indicate, on the other hand, that the eProfile, in its first year of implementation, is not perceived as 'user-friendly'. This is a perception which we share, in the light of formal and informal feedback we invited from all users. We have already taken steps to address the issue of "clunkiness" and to make use of the tool more time efficient and less labour intensive. We have also disseminated "Getting started with the eProfile" guides for students and mentors/personal tutors and provided more practical training for users. We are confident that the eProfile experience in 2013-14 will be more positive and already have some interim evaluative evidence to support this.

We appreciate very much the time, effort and consideration you have given not only to this extremely helpful report but also to your very positive contribution during the course of your visit in May.

We are deeply grateful to you for your support and collegiality.

With sincere thanks and best wishes

Yours sincerely

Head of School of Education