

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT Received 29/01/2020

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

School of Education

Subject(s):

MA Deaf Education (Teacher of the Deaf) programme

Programme(s) / Module(s):

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

Ma, PGDip

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 assignments/ tasks are designed in a meticulous manner aiming not only to meet the University outcomes but also the professional outcomes. So, assignments not only require the students to be reflective in their approach but they are also well fitted in practice. This is a great evidence of good practice especially within mandatory qualification programmes.

In addition, **the support that the deaf students receive throughout the programme has to be applauded.**

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 newly designed professional skills portfolio is a great enhancement of the programme.

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 concerns raised.

For Examiners in the first year of appointment only

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

For Examiners completing their term of appointment only

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

Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.

The programme is well structured and designed to meet the aims and learning outcomes appropriately and effectively.

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

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)

The influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching is really clear. There is a clear synergy between teaching and research evidence practice within the programme. It will be good to see the recent and current research that the teaching team is undertaking incorporated into the teaching materials.

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)?	Y
-----	--	---

Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:

The programme has been accredited by NCTL to meet the competencies required for the Mandatory Qualification for teachers of hearing impaired children. Mandatory qualifications (MQs) are currently being reviewed as part of the Whole School SEND (schools' workforce) DfE contract. The programme lead at the University of Leeds has actively been engaged in the consultation process of this review. She is the lead person of all the course providers in the field involved in the consultation. **The content and the structure of the programme will need to be reviewed and changed accordingly to meet the requirements of the new set of MQ outcomes likely to be out in 2020.**

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>The assessment methods are appropriate for the learning outcomes. The design and structure of the assessments is appropriate both to the academic and professional outcomes.</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></p> <p>The academic standards of students on this programme are high and in line with other similar courses. Students' performance is comparable to the performance of students in relation to students at the (of which I have the closest knowledge of). The weakest students are in most cases (not all) those who have English as a second language. However, I am aware that those students are getting ample and suitable support from the programme lead and tutors in the programme. For failing assignments loads of comments and guidance is always given to students to enable them to improve.</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?	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

I just want to reemphasise the high quality of teaching and learning and support offered to students on this programme. The quality of teaching material is excellent and kept up to date. **When speaking to students over the phone during my visits to the University for exam boards, all students comment favourably on how supportive and responsive the programme team is.**

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

MA Deaf Education (Teacher of the Deaf) programme

Programme(s) / Module(s):

EDUC 5071/8
EDUC 5072
EDUC 5073
EDUC 5076/9
EDUC 5435

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

MA Deaf Education (with QTOD) , MA Deaf Education. PGDip Deaf Education with QTOD

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

School of Education

Address for communication:

Hillary Place
University of 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) must be sent 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

The recent changes to the assessment approach has been welcomed by students. Students now complete two tasks that assessed two different skill sets and draws together theory and practice.

We endeavour to offer a wide range of appropriate support for students recognising that most are working full time as they are studying. We are currently encouraging students to engage more actively in joint online activities to provide them with a more substantial peer support network.

has been very supportive of these adaptations to the assessment and practices offering valuable advice

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

Again this initiative has been supported by . The revised portfolio has enabled us to assess the practical requirements of QTOD aspect of the qualification in a more focused manner.

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:

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:

The synergy between research and teaching is hugely important for the programme. Recent research with deaf children of Roma families, builds on previous work with deaf children from diverse linguistic backgrounds. This work is shaping our approach to and understanding of language development of deaf children. This is incorporated into the underlying philosophy of the programme.

As indicated there will be a requirement to review the programme content and assessment once the new MQ competencies are agreed by the DfE.

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:

The assessments have recently been redeveloped. Student feedback for the assignments will be carefully monitored. We are always considering ways to support students with their assignments, particularly those students who are returning to study after a considerable break.

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

There are inevitably some students who find the academic requirements of the programme challenging as the programme forms a professional qualification and a legal requirement to work as a ToD. Consequently students' motivation for the programme may not be aligned with other Masters level students. This is an area I would like to develop through alternative assessment and targeted support practices.

I would like to thank for invaluable support and insight.