

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	Education
Subject(s):	<i>Mathematics Education</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	EDUC2071, EDUC3060
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BA

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.
The assessment methods are relevant to the material examined and allow students to develop writing skills which are usually not that common with mathematics students.

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 module continues to attract very good students and the tasks that are suggested both for both assignments are very interesting and engaging.

Matters for Urgent Attention

N/A

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiners Handbook?	Y / N
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?	Y / N
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	Y / N

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	Y
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	Y
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y
7.	Have you acted as a External Examiner Mentor?	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

The following text was inserted in me previous examiner report when I thought I had come to the end of my term. What I have written stands for this year too – I am very pleased to have served as external examiner for your institution find I would once more like to take the occasion to thank all academic and support staff for their kindness and efficiency in dealing with matters regarding the external examining process.

I have been delighted to act as External Examiner for these mathematics education modules part of the BA Education for the past 4 years. The administration of the programme has always been very efficient and my comments have always been responded to in a timely and satisfactory manner. The modules I have been External

Examiner for are modules aimed at mathematics students interested in the teaching and learning of mathematics and as such I think are important as they give the students skills which would not be necessarily fostered in a mathematics degree. These modules may indeed open a pathway for these students on to a secondary PGCE or other initial teacher training making them better prepared for it. I have always been impressed by the quality of the student work I have seen and certainly the quality of feedback has been one of the strengths of these modules. The design of the assessment is ideal to allow students to showcase their strengths.

I would like to thank the support staff who have made my work very smooth and the academic staff who during the years have provided a very good teaching experience for the students. Certainly – I myself have learned a great deal from this experience.

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
<p><i>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</i></p> <p>The modules continue to attract good students and have high standards as in previous years. The learning outcomes are, as in previous years, comparable to those of similar modules in other institutions. I notice that the module has not changed much in the past few years, and perhaps some reflection on the content and organisation would be beneficial at this point. On the whole – however – these remain two very well structured modules.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<p><i>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)</i></p> <p>As in previous years the impact of research on the teaching is very much evident in the students' work.</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i></p>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i></p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i></p>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<p><i>Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs, in particular: the design and structure of the assessment methods, and the arrangements for the marking of modules and the classification of awards; the quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods that may be indicated by student performance.</i></p> <p>Yes – as always the tasks are very interesting and tie in well with the assessment criteria and learning outcomes of the modules. The essay titles are very suitable to allow students to develop critical reading and critical writing skills.</p>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y

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:

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

The electronic marking made the whole process very smooth – and the he only glitches experienced last year were fixed. I hope that these two modules will be continued in the coming academic years. Not only the staff is dedicated and the students achieve well – but they give mathematics students who take them the possibility to develop critical thinking and academic writing skills which they would not otherwise practice.

The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiners 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?	Y
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?	N
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

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:

I would like to thank the administrative staff for their help in organising all paperwork related to the External Examiner role.

Other comments

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

I hope that these two modules will be continued in the coming academic years. Not only the staff is dedicated and the students achieve well – but they give mathematics students who take them the possibility to develop critical thinking and academic writing skills which they would not otherwise practice.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Faculty / School of:

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

Head of School	
Education	
Hillary Place University of Leeds Leeds LS2 9JT	

*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 very delighted with your encouraging observations that the staff is dedicated and the students achieve well.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

We appreciate your observations that comments that your reports from the previous years have always been considered, and that advice was incorporated into practice.

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:

We are pleased with your observation that there are no urgent matters regarding QA, and we welcome your advice that since the modules have not changed much in the past few years, 'perhaps some reflection on the content and organisation would be beneficial at this point.' Plans are underway to revise and rewrite aspects of EDUC2071, ready for the year 2018/19.

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 very pleased with your comments that 'the administration of the programme has always been very efficient and my comments have always been responded to in a timely and satisfactory manner.' We are very pleased to know that being an external examiner at our university has been a very positive experience for you. We would like to thank you for the enormous amount of time, effort and consideration you have given to this extremely helpful report. It has been a great pleasure working with you.

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 appreciate your evaluation that the aims and outcomes of the programme adequately satisfy undergraduate level award, are in line with the subject benchmark; that the assessment methods and the quality of students' work reflects the ILOs; and 'as in previous years, comparable to those of similar modules in other institutions.'

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 very encouraged with your observation and comment that 'the electronic marking made the whole process very smooth – and the he only glitches experienced last year were fixed'. You found the quality of the student work and the quality of feedback very impressive, an observation you have highlighted over the years; we are very delighted indeed. We will ensure that the design of the assessment shall continue 'to allow students to showcase their strengths'.

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:

We are extremely pleased that you found the structure and arrangements for coursework and the assessments very organised, stimulating and appropriate for the progression and award process.

Other comments

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

We are very grateful to you for your invaluable and supportive final comment that these two modules should be continued in the coming academic years since 'they give mathematics students who take them the possibility to develop critical thinking and academic writing skills which they would not otherwise practice'.