

**Subject External Examiner Annual Report – 2016/17** (reporting period)

<b>Name of External Examiner:</b>	Dr V Door
<b>Examiner's Institution / Employment base:</b>	Keele University

<b>Name(s) of Programme(s):</b>	<b>Partner institution(s) involved in Programmes :</b> (if relevant)
<b>Cornwall SCITT (PGCE with QTS)</b>	

Notes:

- Please respond fully to all bullet points as one sentence responses may not give the programme team sufficient information to enable them to enhance the programme.
- Please do not include names of staff or students in the report.
- In line with the Quality Code (Chapter 7, Indicator 14), reports will be made available in full to students (with the exception of any confidential report made to the Vice Chancellor). Reports will be amended where the External Examiner has contravened the requirement not to identify individuals, or in very exceptional cases where the External Examiner has included something intended to cause harm to the institution or to bring it into disrepute. Where text is removed from reports prior to publication this will be indicated by < \*\* > within the body of the report [[QAA Quality Code, Chapter B7, Indicator 14 refers](#)].
- **Collaborative provision:** For programmes with multiple collaborative partner deliveries, please ensure that your report provides separate commentary for each partnership.
- **QTS programmes:** If you are responsible for moderation on QTS programmes, please ensure that you complete Appendix 1 of this report as this is a requirement of our evidence base for Ofsted audit.

***Thank you for your continued support and contribution to the University's quality assurance and enhancement process.***

Please return your report by email ([externalexaminers@cumbria.ac.uk](mailto:externalexaminers@cumbria.ac.uk)) within **6 weeks of the Assessment Board** and, for undergraduate programmes, by **31<sup>st</sup> July**.

**Annual Fee** is payable on receipt of a claim form (available from [www.cumbria.ac.uk/externalexaminers](http://www.cumbria.ac.uk/externalexaminers)). Payment of fees is conditional upon completion of report.

## Section 1 - Academic and Professional Standards

The information in this section informs programme review and development at all levels within the University. Please comment on the following:

1. *Whether the academic standards [and professional where appropriate] are comparable to similar modules in other HEIs in the UK and with which you are familiar.*
2. *The overall academic standard [and professional where appropriate] of the modules and thereby the standard of the award[s] of which they are components.*
3. *Whether threshold standards meet subject benchmark, FHEQ, and Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body requirements.*
4. *Does the programme and its component parts continue to be coherent and generally up-to-date and at an appropriate level to enable students to meet the relevant aims and learning outcomes?*
5. *The quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods that may be indicated by student performance.*
6. *The opportunities provided to enhance the quality of the learning opportunities afforded to students.*
7. *The quality of learning opportunity afforded by the student placement (if applicable).*
8. *There is no formal requirement for External Examiners to meet with students but please comment, as appropriate, on any opportunities you have had to meet, or engage, with students.*
9. ***If your appointment includes programmes or modules delivered as collaborative provision (such as franchised delivery), please state the name of the partner, and also comment on:***
  - a. *The comparison of standards between the University and Partner delivery of the programme (if relevant).*
  - b. *Whether student performance provided evidence of access to appropriate learning resources at the Partner.*
  - c. *The operation and management of the partnership between the University and partner.*

Academic standards are in line with providers nationally and in several instances, above average. Academic criteria used are both appropriate and helpful, enabling students to perform at the two nationally accepted FHEQ levels of 6 and 7. Professional standards demanded are also in line with national ones. The course overall provides once again, an outstanding example of integration of professional standards with HE academic ones. Students, school staff and PGCE staff continue to be aware of this integration and to be working together to ensure that it is a valuable and consistent feature of the whole course.

In two days of school visiting schools I met students, head teachers, professional tutors, mentors as well as classroom teachers. I was able to observe lessons across 2 Key Stages, from students of DT, Maths, MFL, and Physics. I observed 2 students who provided evidence for Grade 1, one with evidence for Grade 1 or 2 and one student (Physics) who was on course for Grade 3 or 4. I took part in a debrief with all these students and was provided with supporting evidence through what they said, of the appropriateness of their current grading. I was able to have a conversation with a PE student (the lesson had been cancelled by the school) who was expected to get a Grade 2. I was able to have a close look at the portfolios of all these students.

Student performance in all cases was in line with national standards for students with those expected grades, with the two Grade ones being at the high end of performance (DT, Maths). Most of the students and school staff involved had an informed and constructive conception of course requirements and were using the SCITT programme information as well as national documentation to help guide them in achieving PGCE with QTS.

All students had a very clear idea of what how to use programme and national information to help them achieve the standards, and I was able to observe this in lesson planning, delivery

and evaluation. The student who was a borderline fail was receiving appropriate support, in line with the kind of support given in high-quality PGCE/QTS courses. He had been judged to be a Cause for Concern towards the end of his second placement. His progress had been and continued to be, closely monitored and he was aware of his situation. The other students were able to discuss progress meaningfully in the light of programme, school and national guidelines. Their understanding of the importance of using theory to inform practice was very good. They were able to articulate their own Level 6 /7 differentiation and were happy with the choices they had made in this regard. Evidence from the assignments themselves and from discussion was that students understood criteria, and were using their reading and writing to improve practice. All students showed an attitude of critical engagement with assignments and professional practice and thought that the nature of the assignments were sowing the seeds for future practice development. Their initial SEND assignment had proved particularly relevant to their practice at an early stage of the course.

Students had found college-based sessions useful, and were particularly impressed by the way the course approached subject pedagogy, and more general aspects of being a teacher, both in college and in the school-based sessions. As last year, there was no hint from students that assignment writing as an 'add-on' or a waste of time. They all regarded support from SCITT as exemplary in academic, professional, personal and administrative areas. They were, once again, impressed by the responsiveness of SCITT to feedback. The structure and location of school-based sessions was also praised by students and school staff. Students were particularly grateful for the chance to meet with peers which they considered minimised feelings of isolation and enabled sharing of problems and successes.

Mentors and Professional Tutors were, once again, very well informed about course expectations and were using course documentation to support and develop student performance. Some commented on how SCITT material complemented their own school teaching and learning programmes.

Students were happy with the range and number of classes and key stages they were able to teach. They all had an appropriate timetable for students at that stage of the course. They had appreciated the experience of a contrasting placement. No student was unhappy with the ABA pattern of placements.

As last year, Mentors and Tutors voiced their appreciation of involvement with the SCITT, finding it enriching for their own practice, and for the school generally.

In contrast to last year, no student voiced concern about the demands of keeping a Standards file. Three students emphasised how useful they had found them, and appreciation of the exemplars they had been able to look at, at the SCITT. I consider that this shows an advance on last year, where students were concerned about file keeping.

## **Section 2 - The Assessment Process**

The information in this section contributes to Departmental and programme quality processes and also informs programme review and development.

Please comment on the following:

1. *Whether the internal assessment / examination procedures are comparable with similar programmes in the UK.*
2. *The operation of the Module Assessment Board (MAB) and whether the procedures followed were fairly and rigorously conducted (including procedures governing extenuating circumstances, misconduct and borderline performance), and in accordance with the University's Academic Regulations.*
3. *The appropriateness of the design and structure of the assessment methods used, comparability and level within modules, and their effectiveness in measuring the overall learning outcomes. Where applicable please comment on the achievement of learning outcomes in professional placements / work based learning / work experience.*
4. *The distribution of marks [eg range, mean, clustering.*
5. *The moderation process and consistency of marking standards. Please elaborate, particularly with reference to multi-site delivery / collaborative provision (as appropriate).*
6. *The range of examinations papers / assignments provided for sampling purposes and their appropriateness in terms of subject / level / learning outcomes.*
7. *The rigour and fairness of the assessment process overall (including assessment criteria and marking schemes.*
8. ***If your appointment includes programmes or modules delivered as collaborative provision (such as franchised delivery) please provide separate commentary in respect of each partner.***

From my reading and analysis of an appropriate sample of all 3 assignments, and from observations and discussions with students, mentors and professional tutors, as well as with college tutors, I am assured that assessment processes are robust and completely in line with national expectations and guidelines.

I was not present at any of the MABs.

As last year, assignment titles and contents guidelines, including reading lists, provide good springboards for students to develop an academic dimension to their classroom and whole-school practice. Students achieve a good-to-high level of criticality in terms of their own reflective evaluations. I thought that there was a slightly deeper engagement with the literature, and a willingness to critique it rather than use it as source for citing than last year. There is no doubt that this academic side of the course adds huge value to the professional in-school practice and should continue to be nurtured and developed. Despite the work involved, the students I met said that without it, their practice would have been impoverished.

Blind double marking of assignments provides necessary impartiality and University and FHEQ criteria have been adhered to.

In the schools I went into, it was clear that school staff were involved in discussions on assignment-related topics, particularly on SEND.

In line with last year, the range of marks and quality of writing of the sample were within the normal range supplied to an examiner. Marking of the sample was, in my view, accurate and in line with national academic standards. Feedback from markers included in-text comments and summative commentary at the end. The best feedback was detailed, and gave ideas for improvement. It was good to see that this 'formative' aspect of summative comment was in evidence even in the last assignment, giving student encouragement to continue with this sort of study.

Students are also assessed through their portfolios, which can be hard or electronic. As mentioned above, the students I met said they had found the exemplars of portfolios had been very useful for them and they were confident they knew how to go about making them. The portfolios were easy for me to navigate, and contained appropriate evidence to support

final grading. The use of one book for records of all mentor meetings, targets, actions and a reflective log each week was particularly impressive as it charted progression of understanding and practice through the year.

### Section 3 - Organisation and Arrangements

The information in this section contributes to the University's monitoring process.

Please comment on the following:

1. *How the University has helped you undertake your role effectively.*
2. *The specific external examiner activities you have undertaken and your level of satisfaction with your involvement in assessment procedures at module level.*
3. *The appropriateness and timing of information, of draft examination papers for approval and student work for moderation.*
4. *The induction training designed to familiarise External Examiners with the University's Regulations/Procedures concerning assessment [newly appointed External Examiners only]*

I had induction by the University last year.

This year, I received information on the University expectations and programme documentation in good time.

I was sent what seemed to be representative samples of student material from the SCITT at regular intervals. In the school visits, I was able to look at student and mentor documentation. All this was at or above national standards.

Visits to schools were very well organised and I appreciated the welcome and treatment that I received. I was able to talk, sometimes at length, to key staff, as well as to the students. I was given every opportunity to ask questions and observe procedures.

### Section 4 - Comments

The section provides you with the opportunity to comment on any aspect(s) of the programme(s) not covered elsewhere in this report. (If your appointment includes programmes or modules delivered as collaborative provision (such as franchised delivery), please provide separate commentary, if relevant in respect of each partner).

### Section 5 - Good Practice

List areas that you wish to commend as positive features/areas of good practice and/or innovative practice relating to teaching, learning and assessment which are worthy of dissemination and may be shared with other programmes within the University or elsewhere. **(If your appointment includes programmes or modules delivered as collaborative provision (such as franchised delivery), please provide separate commentary, as relevant, in respect of each partner).**

The structure of the students' reflective log book and the evident collaboration between school staff and student across the 2 placement schools is worthy of dissemination, as is the degree of collaboration and communication between SCITT and school staff.

#### **Section 6 - Issues which require Action/Response and Opportunities for Enhancement**

Please list any recommendations or actions arising from your report along with any opportunities to enhance the quality of the learning opportunities offered to students.

It would be helpful if you could indicate which, in your opinion, are **urgent and essential, advisable or desirable**.

**If your appointment includes programmes or modules delivered as collaborative provision (such as franchised delivery) please provide separate commentary in respect of each partner.**

Urgent

Essential

Advisable

Desirable: To continue at the present level of provision.

#### **Section 7 - Issues and Recommendations from Previous Reports**

Have issues raised in previous reports been appropriately considered and, where appropriate, acted upon?

The two constructive suggestions I made last year, that there should be more input on Standards files, and even more opportunity for school staff to be involved in SCITT development, have been addressed.

#### **Section 8 - First Year of Appointment**

If this was the first year of your appointment, please comment on the level of support you received from (i) your mentor (if relevant), and (ii) the Department

#### **Section 9 - Final Year of Appointment**

If this is your final year of appointment, it would be helpful if you could give an overview on the progress that has been made during your period of office. This information will also serve to inform the incoming external examiner about the developments during the previous period of review. You might comment particularly on:

- The progressive development and enhancement of the learning, teaching and assessment provision.
- The standards achieved.
- The marking and assessment.
- The appropriateness of assessment procedures and processes.
- If your appointment includes programmes or modules delivered as collaborative provision (such as franchised delivery) please provide separate commentary, as relevant, in respect of each partner.

My period of appointment has been shortened.

As far as I am aware, no external examiner from Cumbria will be required for the Cornwall SCITT.

Signed: Victoria Door

Name [please print]: Dr Victoria Door

Date: 19/06/17

Once completed, please return by email to: [externalexaminers@cumbria.ac.uk](mailto:externalexaminers@cumbria.ac.uk)

**OFSTED Quality Audit Checklist** (QTS programmes only)

If you are responsible for moderation on QTS programmes, please include detail below under each heading (or provide a cross-reference to earlier sections of your report, as appropriate). This detail provides the University with an evidence base for Ofsted audit as well as an enhancement tool for our ITT programmes.

**(a) Context**

Cornwall SCITT has been running for 17 years, of which 5 years has been with University of Cumbria.

Truro & Penwith College is a partner institution and the named "lead institution"

**(b) Evidence Base**

See Sections 1 and 2 of report

**(c) Summary of key findings**

See Section 1

**(d) Outcomes for trainees**

See Section 2



**(e) Quality of the training across the partnership**

Outstanding

**(f) Leadership and management of the partnership**

Outstanding

**(g) Capacity to improve**

Recommend maintenance of current level

<b>Programme materials</b>			
Did you receive:	Y	N	N/A
a. Programme handbook(s)?	Y		
b. Module Guide(s)?	Y		
c. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria?	Y		
<b>Draft examination papers</b>			
a. (i) Did you receive all the draft papers?			N/A
(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>Marking examination scripts</b>			
a. (i) Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts?	Y		
(ii) If you did not receive all the scripts, was the method of selection satisfactory?	Y		
b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?	Y		
c. Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?	Y		
<b>Dissertations/project reports</b>			
a. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate?	Y		
b. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?	Y		
<b>Coursework/continuously assessed work</b>			
a. Did you receive draft coursework titles?			N/A
b. Was sufficient coursework made available to you for assessment?			
c. Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?			
<b>Orals/performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements</b>			
a. Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct orals and/or moderate performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements?	Y		
<b>Assessment Board</b>			
a. Were you able to attend the meeting?	Not invited		
b. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?			
c. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Assessment Board?			
d. Have you received appropriate feedback to any actions set at the Assessment Board?			
<b>Student Engagement</b>			
a. Were you provided with any opportunities to meet students during the year?	Y		