

Carnegie School Of Education

Undergraduate

- BAECE Early Child Ed Leading to QTS(UG)
- PEQTE Bah Primary Education (Ey 3-7)(UG)

Please indicate, below, whether you agree with the statements about the threshold standards of Leeds Beckett University's awards, student achievement and the conduct of the University's assessment processes, using as a reference the framework for higher education qualifications and applicable Subject Benchmark Statements / Qualification Characteristic Statements. Please also list any shortcomings and areas for commendation. You should expand on any issues you mention here in the main report. If any boxes are ticked "No" the Dean of School or nominee will be alerted and will oversee the response from the Course Director.

Please also list any shortcomings and areas for commendation. You should expand on any issues you mention here in the main report. If any boxes are ticked "No" the Dean of School or nominee will be alerted and will oversee the response from the Course Director.

Standards Set

| | Yes | No |
|---|-----|----|
| "In my view, the threshold academic standards set for the modules/awards meet with the requirements of the relevant National Qualifications Statement's." | X | |

If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short:

Student achievement

| | Yes | No | N/A* |
|--|-----|----|------|
| "In my view, students' who have been awarded qualifications have had the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in course(s) or subjects in other UK institutions with which I am familiar." *Not applicable – if you are a practitioner and are not in a position to assess this statement, please note here: | X | | |

Please provide any further comment on the comparability of collaborative provision

If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short:

Conduct of process

External Examiner's report summary

| | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| "In my view, the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are reliable, rigorous and fairly conducted." | X | |

If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Actions from last year's report

(This will not be relevant if you are examining for the first time)

| |
|-----|
| Yes |
|-----|

Areas of good practice/commendation

Any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to learning, teaching and assessment:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

I particularly liked the videos made by students which formed part of their assessment. Digital competence will be an important part of a teacher's skill set from now on.

Main report

In this section you are asked to describe more fully how the University has or has not maintained threshold academic standards and the quality of the student experience in relation to the course(s) for which you are the external examiner, using as a reference the framework for higher education qualifications and applicable Subject Benchmark Statements / Qualification Characteristic Statements.

Please complete all sections of the form fully and where not applicable please state N/A. Where applicable please also complete the sections for any collaborative provision sampled.

If you are an external examiner for any of the University's Pearson Licensed Centre Programmes (HND/HNC level) provision, please also complete the section on page 9 sections l, m and n entitled "for External Examiners Associated with Pearson Licensed Centre Programmes."

Professional Body Requirements

| | Yes | No | N/A* |
|---|-----|----|------|
| "In my view, the professional body requirements for this course have been met. *Not applicable if the course is not a professional body course please indicate here. | X | | |

If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

(a) The operation and conduct of the Progression and Award Board (and/or Module Board meeting you may also have attended).

The operation of the board was professional and to regulatory standards. There is a further board for me

to attend due to late submissions this year.

(b) The action, if any was required, taken in response to your report of last year. (This will not be relevant if you are examining for the first time.)

(c) The overall performance of the students, in relation to that of comparable levels of work in other institutions.

The students performance is comparable to other institutions and I have no concerns. I know Leeds Beckett are also leading the sector in closing the BAME awarding gap and whilst I have not been privy to this data for this programme, I am sure the tea are monitoring this and other potential awarding gaps.

(d) The strengths and weaknesses of the students in general with respect to knowledge, conceptual grasp or application of skills.

Again, this was comparable with other institutions. Grades awarded were in line with FHQA descriptors and the rubrics attached to each module. Stronger students showed greater independence of thought and application.

(e) The standards of the structure, organisation, design and marking of all examination papers and/or other forms of assessment.

The assessments for this programme are varied and there is an element of collaboration which would be expected in their future career choice, too. It is noted however, that the higher grades are awarded in the collaborative assessments. Some modules had an independent and a collaborative element and these were stronger in my opinion. The design of assessments allow for creativity and student choice.

Moderation seems strong in that the team blind mark and then discuss grades reached and a professional discussion against the rubric takes place. It is a small teaching team, however, and it may be worth engaging in some cross-programme moderation to ensure all programmes are assessing accurately and fairly. (This may already take place).

(f) The curriculum, teaching or resourcing of the programme of study as indicated by the performance of the students in the assessment

The curriculum and teaching seem strong (as indicated by grades). I did not meet any students this year, however, there were glimpses on the recordings of student - tutor engagement and it seemed very positive, warm and encouraging.

(g) Comments on the use of My Beckett (Virtual Learning Environment) within the course (if applicable).

This was easy to navigate. I needed a new password at one point and the IT team were fantastic.

(h) Module content, consistency of modules and module assessment across the course and the achievement of learning outcomes. (You may be asked by your School to provide detailed comments on the modules that you examine.)

I examined:

11030 - Historical Perspectives (L5)

13585 Teaching and Learning 2 (L5)

15890 Core subjects at KS1 (L5)

15628 English and Maths Progression (L6)

15625 Teaching and Learning 3 (L6)

11025 Foundation Subjects (L6)

15933 Teacher Practitioner Independent Study (L6)

11026 Creativity through the Curriculum (L6)

There was consistency across all modules in terms of handbooks, delivery and resources. LOs are clear and link both to the FHQA benchmarks and to the Teachers' Standards.

All modules have a close link to teacher practice and a reflective style. Students are encouraged to reflect on their progress towards the Teachers' Standards. Modules are also mapped onto Leeds Beckett Graduate Attributes.

All information needed is clearly communicated to the students.

(i) Areas of student/staff engagement in teaching and learning, scholarship, research or professional practice.

I know the programme leader is engaged in research and this was evident within a module - students also used it in an assessment - this research in practice is great to see. I am not aware of any other research or practice but this is due to not having had much contact from the team - I hope to build on this next year.

(j) The University welcomes external examiners' comments on its academic regulatory framework. Such comments may not have a direct bearing on standards set and achieved or the conduct of processes and so it may not be appropriate to include them elsewhere in this report or its summary. Please record any concerns or comments you may have here.

I have no concerns to report.

(k) Collaborative Provision: please include here any comments you wish to make on elements of

previously in this report).

N/A