

# BA (Hons) Primary Education leading to QTS 2015/16

## External Examiner's report summary

Please indicate in the relevant boxes below whether you agree with the statements about the standards of Leeds Beckett University's awards, the standards of student performance and the conduct of the University's assessment processes.

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 the Faculty or nominee will be alerted and will oversee the response from the course leader.

Standards set		
	Yes	No
"In my view, the standards set for the awards are appropriate."	✓	
If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.		

Student performance			
	Yes	No	N/A *
"In my view, the standards of student performance are comparable with similar course(s) or subjects in other UK institutions with which I am familiar."			✓
I have reviewed a sample of student work from the collaborative / franchise institution and in my view the standards of student performance are comparable with students studying the award(s) at Leeds Bekett.			✓
* Not applicable – if you are a practitioner and are not in a position to assess national standards please indicate here.			
If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.			

Conduct of processes		
	Yes	No
"In my view, the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted."	✓	
If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.		

Areas for commendation
Any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes
<b>There is clear evidence that consistency of feedback, development targets and judgements has been embedded in the relationships between students, mentors and link tutors.</b>
<b>The IDP is an effective document in supporting preparation for placements. This document is continually improved based on feedback and evaluation from schools and students.</b>

## Main report

*In this section you are asked to describe more fully how the University has or has not maintained academic standards and the quality of the student experience in relation to the course(s) for which you are the external examiner.*

**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 / franchise provision sampled.**

**If you are an external examiner for any of the University's Pearson Edexcel (HND/HNC level) provision, please also complete the section on page 8 sections l, m and n entitled "for External Examiners Associated with Edexcel Courses."**

Professional Body Requirements			
"In my view, the professional body requirements for this course have been met.  <i>*Not applicable if the course is not a professional body course please indicate here.</i>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A *</b>
<i>If your answer is 'no', please provide a brief statement (bullet points) of the respect(s) in which they fall short.</i>			

(a) The operation and conduct of the Board of Examiners (and any Mitigation Panel or Examination Committee meeting you may also have attended).

**N/A**

(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.)

Evaluation of the action plan has shown that the course leader and colleagues have high expectations and drive for improvement.

The quality assurance systems and procedures have ensured that consistency of grading and targets has been embedded.

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

On school experience the students observed were assessed in line with other institutions with which I have worked.

Schools reported that the calibre of students was good and students were well prepared for their placements. Students are 'proactive' and 'confident'.

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

### **School Experience**

The students observed and interviewed demonstrated effective classroom teaching and knowledge and understanding in line with QTS standards. This was also evidenced in their IDPs, which according to students were more 'focussed' this year, and record of mentor meetings.

### **Area to Consider**

Similarly to last year the students expressed concern about their ability to assess pupils and felt least confident in this area. This is reflective of the national picture for schools. Students have had access to training from the schools they are in.

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

### **School Experience**

Schools and students felt they were prepared for their placements. Students had serial days and focussed tasks for those days. Students felt that their tasks were an opportunity to recognise theory in the practice they observed.

Further to the action plan implemented by Bradford following the External Examiner report from 2014/5 Early Years students commented that they had relevant tasks to undertake before their placements.

### **Area to consider**

None to report.

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

There is a strong focus for preparation for placements, with good opportunities to put theory into practice and to reflect on practice through the pre-placement tasks.

Students were well prepared for their placements. They felt confident in teaching core subjects.

### **Area to consider**

There were some humanities subjects where students didn't feel confident to teach and they felt an expectation to research for themselves.

As last year, it is clear from student feedback and observation of students teaching that SEN is still an area where students require more input. More specifically it is the lowest ability children who may have an SEN support plan, not statemented children or children who require specific one to one programmes of work.

(g) Comments on the use of X-stream (VLE) within the course (if applicable)..

N/A

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

N/A

(i) Areas of good practice you have identified – please expand on the key areas for commendation listed in the summary.

#### **Placement Documentation**

The revised IDP has ensured that students are well prepared for their placement. The documentation is straightforward and clearly sets out expectations of all those involved.

#### **Link Tutors Moderation**

The moderation has been embedded and has provided a sound process of ensuring the QA of all link tutors. Link tutors provide support, build confidence, nurture, provide reassurance to students as well as identifying their strengths and areas for development. In most cases students know their link tutor before their placement and this would appear to be a positive for the students. There were some inconsistency in the quality of link tutors pre-placement visits. Those who had received a visit on their serial days were most definitely more confident as they started their placements.

(j) The University welcomes external examiners' comments on its developing 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.

N/A

(k) **Collaborative / Franchise Provision:** please include here any comments you wish to make on elements of collaborative / franchise provision for which you have responsibility (in addition to those you may have indicated previously in this report).

N/A

## External Examiners' Report Checklist

Please comment for all boxes

<b>Course Materials</b>				
Did you receive?		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>
a.	Course Handbook(s)?	✓		
b.	Academic Regulations including any Professional Statutory Body requirements where appropriate (these may be included the Course Handbook)?	✓		
c.	Module specifications (these may be in the Course Handbook)?			✓
d.	Assessment briefs/marketing criteria?	✓		

<b>Draft examination papers</b>				
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>
a.	(i) Did you receive all the draft papers?			✓
	(ii) If not, was this at your request?			✓
b.	(i) Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?			✓
	(ii) If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			✓
c.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			✓

<b>Draft coursework</b>				
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>
a.	(i) Did you receive all the draft coursework?			✓
	(ii) If not, was this at your request?			✓
b.	(i) Was the nature and level of the coursework appropriate?			✓
	(ii) If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			✓
c.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			✓

Marking Examination Scripts				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	(i) Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts from both home and (if appropriate) collaborative / franchise partner students?			✓
	(ii) If you did not receive all the scripts, was the method of selection satisfactory?			✓
<p><b>Recommended sample sizes at Leeds Beckett University are as follows:</b></p> <p>a) Samples should be determined by a square root of cohort size, no smaller than 6, no larger than 15. However it should be borne in mind that not all work is assessed in a way that makes a square root sample possible and allowance should be made. For example in subjects such as the performing arts where there may be a requirement for an external to come and view a performance instead, or to visit the exhibition of art work.</p> <p>b) Samples to include all classification categories, and it is helpful to concentrate around the boundaries to include some fails.</p> <p>c) Samples to consist of internally moderated work, clearly evidencing the moderation process.</p>				
b.	Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?			✓
c.	Were the scripts marked in such a way to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?			✓

Dissertations/project reports				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate?			✓
b.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?			✓

Coursework/continuously assessed work				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	Was sufficient coursework made available to you for assessment from both home and (if appropriate) collaborative / franchise partner students?			✓
b.	Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?			✓

Orals/performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct orals and/or moderate performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements?	✓		

Examination Committee/Board of Examiners				
		Yes	No	N/A
a.	Were you able to attend the meetings?		✓	
b.	Were the meetings conducted to your satisfaction?			✓
c.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Examination Committee/Board of Examiners?			✓