

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 10/12/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

<i>Faculty / School of:</i>	Education
<i>Subject(s):</i>	<i>Education</i>
<i>Programme(s) / Module(s):</i>	Doctorate in Education (EdD)/Methods modules EDUC5060, EDUC5061, EDUC5062, EDUC6263
<i>Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):</i>	EdD

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 assessments that are set for the methods modules are nicely planned and varied. There is particular praise for getting students to engage with the quantitative materials at this level. The students I met with praised the programme directors for including all students, especially with the opportunities for attending international conferences to present work. Considerate and constructive feedback is provided on most modules, which is great!

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.
 As alluded to above, the students have been brought together in a new space that helps them feel a greater sense of belonging to the school and to the research culture.

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
 NA

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Handbook?	Y / N
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses to these?	Y / N
3.	Were you provided with an 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 / N
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	Y / N
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y / N
7.	Have you acted as an External Examiner Mentor?	Y / 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

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> The EdD is a small programme (as it is at many institutions). The students get good quality teaching and feedback on their work.</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> The majority of what I review is research methods-related.</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> This is part of an EdD, which prepares students to work at doctoral level. The methods training seems appropriate for doctoral level</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> The assessments all seem appropriate to the methods teaching. For example, students are encouraged to explore research questions and basic methods in their area of interest using a poster and short essay. In quantitative methods, students have three separate portions of the assignment, each of which is designed to assess the ability to critically read quantitative work, consider research design and conduct statistical analyses.</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
<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> There is a varied level of academic achievement on the degree. Some students display outstanding knowledge and understanding; whilst others struggle to write at a level that will pass. In each case, they are provided with useful feedback to help advance their writing and understanding.</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>		

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?	N
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?	N
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y / N
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y / N
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 & 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
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>I was sent some assessment drafts, but not all. Some assessments did not change from last year so this seems appropriate.</p> <p>There were some modules that had handwritten comments on the assessments (5061 & 5062) which were difficult to read.</p> <p>There was a mix-up in sending the correct forms to be signed this Autumn. But that was quickly cleared up when the issue was raised.</p> <p>I was able to attend the June but not the November board. (Tuesdays are very difficult)</p>		

Other comments

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

As usual there were some really impressive pieces of writing that rose to the challenge of the assessments that were set. Unfortunately, students who have failed do not always take up offers of help that are made available to them. I think this is particularly difficult when a number of students are not based locally.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Education

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Doctor of Education
EDUC5060M
EDUC5061M
EDUC5062M
EDUC5063M

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

EdD

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

School of Education

Address for communication:

Hillary Place
University of Leeds
Leeds LS2 9JT

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

Thank you for your positive comments about the EdD programme, particularly with regard to the quantitative methods module and the feedback that we give to our students. I am happy to see that our EdD researchers feel that our PGR community is inclusive and they feel that initiatives such as conference funding are available to them on an equal basis with those taking PhD.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

I am glad to see that EdD researchers appreciate the changes made to the Coach House to provide better PGR space.

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:

N/A

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:

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:

I note your comments with regard to the variable quality of work on some modules. Some of the modules from the EdD, particularly EDUC5060M and EDUC5061M are also taken by students on MA programmes. Not only are these students working at a lower level (with a passmark of 50 rather than 60) but they are also less engaged with research as they tend to take EDUC5060M at the start of the MA, before they have even started to think about their dissertation proposals. EdD researchers, on the other hand, even at an early stage in the programme, have a clear focus on their intended research projects. The School of Education is currently undertaking two reviews of research methods training, one of which seeks to establish the extent to which our current provision is appropriate to the needs of MA students.

I note your comments about handwritten feedback on some assignments. The policy of the School is that feedback should be provided electronically but there are some colleagues who are not able to do this. I understand that this might make it difficult for you to read the feedback and we will explore ways that this could be addressed.

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

All students are provided with the opportunity to submit draft work for feedback and distance should not be a barrier as drafts can be submitted through email and/or Minerva. It is not clear why some students choose not to take up this opportunity but we will continue to encourage all students to submit drafts for feedback