

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT received 08/11/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Education

Subject(s):

Programme(s) / Module(s):

BA Education
 EDUC Modules:
 2107
 3060
 2071
 2105
 3808 [these are all optional modules. Jennifer also looked at core modules 1210, 1211, 1212 and 1213]

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 module statistic sheets with grades and comments were excellent and very helpful. It was great to see that some of the issues I noticed had already been picked up by the team and resolved. The Head of UG and Programme leader seem very willing to engage with the EE and receptive to feedback. After meeting with the student reps, there was a general sense that the students like their programme very much. It was also good to see a number of modules that included a reflective element. As the BA Education is a new programme, there is much potential and scope to create outstanding provision in the non ITE subject area.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.
 N/A as the BA is a new programme and the EE is new to the school as well.

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
 I do not believe there any matters that are significantly urgent. However, there are a number of areas that the programme team could consider for improvement.

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

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?	N
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	Y

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	N
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 an 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

This is my first year as EE for the programme so it is not entirely appropriate to comment on changes at this point.

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.

I have pointed out to the team that some modules have many learning outcomes given the level/credit. It seems that where modules have two assessment points it is not clear which learning outcomes are being assessed. It appears, therefore, that they are actually being assessed twice for the same learning outcome in some instances. I do wonder if this is fair and does it open the door for complaint if they haven't met the LO on assignment but have on another? I recognise this a wider university issue, perhaps beyond the control of the programme.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y / N
-----	---	-------

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 expected to see more up to date research in the students' work (not including seminal texts) than was presented. In the maths and education modules, I had also expected to see something on Maths Mastery and statements on the assignment briefs supported by literature/evidence.

However, there were clear links between theory/research and practice in the placement module I examined.

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 / N
<p>I did not see a range of assessment methods and I think this is something the programme team could improve upon. Even though assignment briefs stated the method as a portfolio, reflective log or report, the students submitted essays. I think there should be range of methods in order to be more inclusive but also to help students develop skills in another academic writing genres. In addition, some of the assignments lend themselves to the use of technology and enhancing student's digital capabilities useful for employment.</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 / N
<p><i>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:</i></p> <p>I noticed there were not many marks in the first-class band (with the exception of one module). I did wonder if there was a link between this and the fact that most assessment is done via essays. However, I thought the marking was fair so perhaps this is a true reflection of the cohort. Would a contextualised mark scheme at module level help student achievement?</p> <p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i></p> <p>A key area the team should focus on is the clarity of the assignment briefs. This links to my previous comment about essays. For example, if the assignment brief states portfolio then I would expect to see a portfolio and not an essay.</p>		

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?	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?	Y
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

It was noted in the IM process marks were changed. It is felt that this is not fair to the students whose work was chosen to be moderated. It is policy at the that marks should not be changed (unless there is a significant issue and then everyone's marks are changed) in the IM process. Is this something that can be considered at Leeds?

One of the student reps said that the marketing material online states there are no exams; however, has had an exam. If this is the case, it needs attending to as a result of CMA regulations.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Education

Programme(s) / Module(s):

BA Education
 EDUC Modules:
 2107
 3060
 2071
 2105
 3808 [these are all optional modules. Jennifer also looked at core modules 1210, 1211, 1212 and 1213]

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

BA

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

School of 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) 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 pleased that you find the module statistic sheets helpful and that you were pleased the we had been able to address some of the issues you had raised and that the head of undergraduate programmes and the programme leader engaged with your feedback. As you know the programme has the potential to create outstanding provision in the non ITE subject area and we look forward to working with you to achieve this.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

Not applicable

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:

Not applicable.

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:

12. We agree that all assessment briefs should indicate which learning objectives are being addressed, and we should ensure that each LO is assessed once in a module. The assignment briefs for EDUC1213 did this. The programme leader will review this across all core modules with the programme team in the coming weeks.

13. We note your comment on the kind of research that students include in their assessments. We review the use of research and other literature on a regular basis and will be looked at for next year.

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:

17. We take your point about the range of assessment methods and will bear this in mind for next year and beyond, with a particular focus on ensuring the differently named assignment briefs are distinct.

19. We will consider whether our assignment briefs are impacting on the range of student marks.

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:

Other comments

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

We note that one of the students you spoke to had taken an examination. There are no examination on the core modules for the programme. However, it would appear that a student has taken a discovery module which included an examination.