



University  
*of* Exeter

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

EXTERNAL EXAMINATION  
OF  
PGCE PROGRAMMES  
2023-24

© University of Exeter 2024

School of Education  
Faculty of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences  
University of Exeter  
St Luke's Campus  
Heavitree Road  
Exeter EX1 2LU

Every effort has been made to ensure that this handbook is accurate at the date of publication. The University of Exeter reserves the right to change this information if necessary.



## Table of Contents

1. THE ROLE OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS .....	4
1.1 CONSTITUTION .....	4
1.2 THE PURPOSE OF EXTERNAL EXAMINATION ON ITE PROGRAMMES.....	4
1.3 THE ROLE OF THE CHIEF EXTERNAL EXAMINER .....	4
1.4 THE ROLE OF THE PRIMARY/SECONDARY EXTERNAL EXAMINERS .....	5
1.5 FAILING TRAINEES .....	5
1.6 REPORTS .....	6
2. PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES FOR SCHOOL VISITS BY PRIMARY/SECONDARY EXTERNAL EXAMINERS.....	7
3. PRIMARY/SECONDARY EXTERNAL EXAMINATION VISIT CHECKLIST .....	8
4. PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES FOR SCHOOL VISITS BY THE CHIEF EXTERNAL EXAMINER .....	9
5. WHAT TO EXPECT DURING THE EXTERNAL EXAMINATION PERIOD .....	10
6. THE GEOGRAPHY OF OUR PARTNERSHIP .....	11
7. UNIVERSITY OF EXETER QUALITY REVIEW FRAMEWORK: EXTERNAL EXAMINING .....	12
8. EXAMPLE OF EXAMINER ONLINE REPORT FORM.....	19
9. GLOSSARY OF TERMS .....	25
10. FAILURE AND CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE PROCEDURES FOR TRAINEES ON PGCE PROGRAMMES .....	27

If you require further information about external examination procedures please contact:

Jon Vague  
Senior Administrator  
(Partnership)

Tel: 01392 723326

E-mail: [j.m.vague@exeter.ac.uk](mailto:j.m.vague@exeter.ac.uk)

Corinne Greaves  
Partnership Director

Tel: 01392 722834

E-mail: [c.b.greaves@exeter.ac.uk](mailto:c.b.greaves@exeter.ac.uk)

Lisa Fripp  
ITE Programme Manager  
(Partnership)

Tel: 01392 724868

Email: [l.m.fripp@exeter.ac.uk](mailto:l.m.fripp@exeter.ac.uk)

Partnership Office, University of Exeter, School of Education, Heavitree Road, Exeter EX1 2LU

*Copyright University of Exeter, School of Education*

*Revised April 2024*

# 1. THE ROLE OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

## 1.1 CONSTITUTION

External Examiners of PGCE programmes are appointed by the university to fulfil the roles outlined below. Each examiner reports to a School of Education Examination Board (known as an Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee or APAC) that comprises the Chief External Examiner, all Primary/Secondary External Examiners, relevant university tutors and the Director of Education or Head of School, who acts as Chair.

There are two categories of External Examiner for PGCE programmes: the Chief External Examiner and the Primary/Secondary External Examiner. Both are required to submit an annual written report, which is seen by the relevant programme leaders and the ITE Management team. The university's *Quality Review Framework: External Examining* document applies to the roles of both the Chief and Primary/Secondary External Examiners and can be found at:

<http://as.exeter.ac.uk/academic-policy-standards/tqa-manual/externalexamininghandbook/>

External Examiners are informed of the partnership pass/fail criteria to meet the Standards for the award of Qualified Teacher Status (Teachers' Standards (2012) and the University of Exeter award of a PGCE. They are also informed of the processes by which the partnership training is undertaken. They have access to partnership documentation relating to the trainees' programmes.

## 1.2 THE PURPOSE OF EXTERNAL EXAMINATION ON ITE PROGRAMMES

The purpose of external examination on ITE programmes is to:

- evaluate the **accuracy of partnership assessment of trainees'** competence by:
  - observing trainees teaching
  - holding discussions on trainees' competence with university tutors and school based mentors
  - scrutinising Formative Reflection on Achievement and Progress and summative reports and the accompanying evidence.
- evaluate the **nature and quality of the school/university partnership provision:**
  - through discussion with trainees, university tutors and school based mentors
  - by reading programme and subject/age phase handbooks
  - through scrutiny of trainees' Individual Development Portfolio and teaching files.
- evaluate the **quality of professional and academic engagement with assignments** through consideration of a sample of assignments, representing the full range available. External Examiners are asked to:
  - evaluate whether the assignments are relevant and appropriate to the award of a PGCE at M level
  - evaluate the nature and quality of trainees' engagement with the assignments
  - to consider the appropriateness of the marker's feedback and summative assessment.

## 1.3 THE ROLE OF THE CHIEF EXTERNAL EXAMINER

The Chief External Examiner of ITE programmes considers the whole programme with a particular remit to look at programme coherence and consistency, and the quality of provision when compared with similar provision nationally. In particular, the Chief External Examiner will:

- review the Professional Studies activities and provision, both in school and university
- meet with groups of trainees and school based mentors
- look at a range of assignments across the subjects/age phases
- look at a sample of paperwork from trainees failing to meet the Teachers Standards
- act as Chair and Spokesperson for the Primary/Secondary Examiner team
- chair the pre-APAC meeting -a meeting between all external examiners to discuss their findings (University staff are not in attendance at this meeting).
- attend the APAC meeting

- summarise the findings of the Primary/Secondary External Examiner team and report this verbally at the APAC meeting
- prepare a written summary of these conclusions and report to the Education Policy, Quality & Standards Team.

#### 1.4 THE ROLE OF THE PRIMARY/SECONDARY EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

The main role of a Primary/Secondary External Examiner is to support the moderation, monitoring and evaluation of the programme by:

- ensuring that the assessment procedures employed by the programme and the judgments made are rigorous, fair and valid
- ensuring that assessment judgments made are comparable with similar programmes in other UK higher education institutions
- ensuring that the academic and professional standards expected of trainees are commensurate with the relevant national qualifications framework and the requirements of OFSTED in the inspection of Initial Teacher Education
- preparing a written report and submitting this to the Education Policy, Quality and Standards Team

Primary/Secondary External Examiners are asked to consider the nature, quality and appropriateness of provision by each school/university partnership visited by observing trainees in classroom-focused work, considering the supporting documentation and holding appropriate discussions with them, their school-based mentors, and ITEC; and to evaluate the evidence for such provision. They are asked in particular to assess provision across a range of contexts (school type, style of implementation).

The examination is of the whole programme, both school and university elements, not simply trainees' classroom competence. It is not a requirement that Primary/Secondary External Examiners observe classroom teaching on each visit, but it is an expectation that at least one trainee in each Primary/Secondary External Examiner's visit schedule will be observed teaching (this may be a recorded session rather than live teaching).

As far as possible, Primary/Secondary External Examiners should encounter:

- A range of trainees in school settings and via group meetings
- assignments representing a range of marks
- contrasting contexts for the implementation of partnership policies.

#### 1.5 FAILING TRAINEES

All trainees who are considered by the partnership to be failing to meet the pass criteria will have an examination visit by an Internal Moderator who will act in the role of examiner and be involved in the decision-making process regarding pass or fail. They will refer to the evidence, through the documentation presented by the trainee, school-based mentors and university tutors, observation of the trainee working with pupils and through interviews with the trainee and school-based tutors. The Internal Moderator will complete a *Moderation Visit Report* for each trainee who has received a 'fail' recommendation from the school/university partnership.

**Where there is a trainee with a fail decision**, the role undertaken by the **External Examiners** is to investigate the documentation containing the evidence of the trainee's progress; to consider whether the documentation supports this decision and that the process leading to this was followed and to consider whether this decision is equitable with others made across the programme.

In these cases, **Primary/Secondary External Examiners** undertake examination of the programme by:

- reading the Moderation Visit Report, Formative Reflection on Achievement and Progress (Developing Independence phase), Final Summative Report and most recent UVT visit records for trainees receiving a moderation visit.. They will be asked to form a judgement about whether the documentation provided supports the decisions made.

**The Chief External Examiners** will undertake examination of the programme by:

- reading the Moderation Visit Report, Formative Reflection on Achievement and Progress (Developing

Independence phase) and Final Summative Report for a sample of 'Fail' trainees across the programme to form a judgement about whether the decisions made are equitable across the programme.

The recommendation is presented to the APAC for the relevant programme. In the case of a fail decision the recommendation of the APAC meeting is then referred to the Faculty level APAC Meeting (Consequences Board) to discuss and agree the consequences of failure and conditions of return to the programme. Trainees who fail may have the opportunity to repeat their final school placement, on not more than one subsequent occasion and within two years of their first attempt; or to complete/resubmit written work. In certain circumstances it may not be appropriate to offer a re-sit opportunity – this would be discussed at and confirmed at the Faculty level APAC Meeting.

**For further information on the consequences of failure, see the [Failure and Consequences of Failure Procedures for Trainees on PGCE Programmes](#) document at the end of this handbook.**

## 1.6 REPORTS

Each Primary/Secondary External Examiner is required to provide a written report to the university, via the Education Policy, Quality and Standards Team, detailing the nature and quality of provision seen.

Primary/Secondary External Examiners should:

- report on trainees seen in schools on examination visits, referring to
  - their teaching competence
  - evidence presented in their Individual Development Portfolio (IDP) and teaching file(s)
  - the support offered by partnership schools and the university.
  
- make overall comments on
  - the quality of trainees' teaching in the subject that they observe being taught. Primary examiners should include comments about how English, Maths or Science (as allocated to them each year) is delivered to and taught by both specialists and non-specialists, and comments about the quality of teaching in any other subjects that they observed being taught
  - the quality of partnership training by schools and the university, including both the university taught course and school-based training
  - the quality and relevance of assignments
  - any other comments which will help to improve the subjects/curriculum areas they encounter unless they are generic, in which case they should be passed on to the Chief External Examiner as described below.

The Chief External Examiner is required to report orally at the APAC meeting and to provide a **written report** to the university, via the Education Policy, Quality and Standards Team, detailing the nature and quality of provision across the programme examined. Primary/Secondary External Examiners should pass on to their Chief External Examiner any comments that are of a whole programme/generic nature for inclusion in the Chief's report, as appropriate.

The University of Exeter uses an **on-line reporting process** for external examiner reports. The university's Education Policy, Quality and Standards Team will send each examiner further details, including a link to the on-line form. Examiner reports should be submitted within four weeks of the APAC meeting. Once submitted, the Education Policy, Quality and Standards Team will forward each examiner's report to the School of Education for dissemination to the appropriate ITE programme staff.

No reports **should include the names of trainees, schools or members of university staff** (if you want to refer to a particular member of staff you should use their job role only). Please also note that External Examiners' reports are public documents.

The work of External Examiners is central to the quality assurance process within the School of Education and we greatly value the professional dialogue the examination period permits and take all comments and evaluations seriously.

## 2. PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES FOR SCHOOL VISITS BY PRIMARY/SECONDARY EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

This summary provides brief practical advice for Primary/Secondary External Examiners in their task of examining the standard of the relevant ITE programme. Appropriate course documentation and a sample of assignments from across the range of pathways/subjects is provided to each Primary/Secondary External Examiner before their visits. During the examination period Primary/Secondary External Examiners may be given further documentation for scrutiny.

### **Before the visit the Primary/Secondary External Examiner should:**

- become familiar with programme requirements, including the pass/fail criteria, through reading the Programme Handbook, Phase Instructions and Profile Descriptors, the relevant subject/pathway handbooks and associated documentation
- become familiar with the role of the Primary/Secondary External Examiner as given in this booklet
- have time to read and scrutinise a sample of assignments
- be provided with an Examination Visit Schedule for each school visit, giving details of school personnel and arrangements
- be advised of and attend any briefing meetings arranged by the university.

### **During the visit the Primary/Secondary External Examiner should (see also [External Examiner Visit Checklist](#)):**

- read the trainee's Developing Independence FRAP, Final Summative Report, most recent University Visiting Tutor (UVT) visit record and Teaching File
- look briefly at the trainee's assignments
- meet with school staff involved in the training process
- interview the trainee, discussing both the training experience and their professional development
- where possible observe the trainee teaching and read the lesson plan, scheme of work and other relevant materials related to the lesson to be observed.

### **After the visit the Primary/Secondary External Examiner should:**

- attend and contribute to the pre-APAC meeting chaired by the Chief External Examiner (or provide a report to the Chief External Examiner in advance of this meeting if unable to attend)
- attend the APAC meeting
- within four weeks of the APAC meeting submit a written report, using the on-line format, to the university via the Education Policy, Quality and Standards Team.

### **When meeting with a group of trainees the Primary/Secondary External Examiner should:**

- discuss topics specified by the Programme Director
- look at any example documentation supplied by the trainees, relevant to the topics being considered
- use this information within the external examination report but not relate it specifically to any trainee(s) in the group, nor make judgements about the trainees based on this discussion.

### 3. PRIMARY/SECONDARY EXTERNAL EXAMINATION VISIT CHECKLIST

**On the school visit the Primary/Secondary External Examiner will normally see:**

- the trainee's Developing Independence FRAP & Final Summative Report, most recent UVT Visit Record and Teaching File
- the trainee's summative and formative assignments (along with feedback)
- the lesson plan, scheme of work and other relevant materials related to the lesson to be observed
- the trainee teaching or, a recording of them teaching
- the Lead Mentor, Reflective Mentor and ITE Coordinator.

**PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING HEADINGS AS A STRUCTURE FOR YOUR VISIT**

#### **DOCUMENTATION**

- Have you read the trainee's documentation?
  - Developing Independence FRAP & Final Summative Report
  - Most recent University Visiting Tutor (UVT) Visit Record
  - Teaching File

#### **LESSON OBSERVATION**

Please consider:

- context of the lesson:
  - within the scheme of work
  - year group of class observed
  - pupils (number, ability group etc)
- lesson plan, scheme of work and other relevant materials related to the lesson to be observed
- structure of the lesson including timing, pace and level of challenge
- the impact of the trainee's teaching on the quality of learning and how this is being monitored and assessed.

#### **INTERVIEWS**

Please consider how evidence about the trainee's progress and the quality of university and school-based training can be verified through the interviews with the:

- trainee
- Lead Mentor
- Reflective Mentor
- ITE Coordinator

Please note that you may not be able to meet all three of the school staff during the visit.

**Finally please consider whether your observations and discussions and the documentation seen support the judgements made about the trainee.**



## 4. PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES FOR SCHOOL VISITS BY THE CHIEF EXTERNAL EXAMINER

This summary provides brief practical advice for Chief External Examiners in their task of examining the standard of the relevant ITE programme. Appropriate programme and course documentation is provided to each Chief External Examiner before the examination visits including a sample of assignments for scrutiny from across the range of subjects/pathways in the programme.

Before the visit the Chief External Examiner should:

- become familiar with programme requirements, including the pass/fail criteria, through reading the Programme Handbook and associated documentation
- become familiar with the role of the Chief External Examiner as given in this booklet
- be provided with an Examination Visit Schedule for each school visit, giving details of school personnel and arrangements
- have time to read and scrutinise a sample of assignments
- be advised of and attend any briefing meetings arranged by the university.

During the visit the Chief External Examiner should:

- meet with school staff involved in the training process
- meet with a group of trainees
- have further time to read and scrutinise a range of assignments/other programme documentation if needed
- have an opportunity to discuss the programme with the Programme Director and Primary/Secondary External Examiners.

After the visit the Chief External Examiner should:

- chair the pre-APAC meeting with Primary/Secondary External Examiners
- present an oral report at the APAC meeting on programme quality and provision
- sign the report of APAC meeting decisions as an accurate record
- within four weeks of the APAC meeting submit a written report, using the on-line format, to the university via the Education Policy, Quality and Standards Team.

When meeting with a group of trainees the Chief External Examiner should:

- discuss topics specified by the Programme Director
- look at any example documentation supplied by the trainees, relevant to the topics being considered
- use this information within the external examination report but not relate it specifically to any trainee(s) in the group, nor make judgements about the trainees based on this discussion.

## 5. WHAT TO EXPECT DURING THE EXTERNAL EXAMINATION PERIOD

New External Examiners will receive a briefing, which will summarise the Exeter Model of ITE and the role of the External Examiner. This will take place prior to the External Examination and will normally take the form of a remote meeting.

When selecting trainees for examiners to visit, consideration is given to the activities that the schools may be engaged in as well as where trainees are available. We also plan some 'reserve' visits but occasionally extenuating circumstances (typically when trainees are called for an interview or are off sick) mean that there is no option but to cancel a visit. We apologise if this happens and lessens the opportunity to see a range of practice.

There will also be an opportunity for conversations with trainees as part of a group.

At the end of the second morning the Chief External Examiner will meet with the Primary/Secondary external examiners who will share feedback of the areas examined to assist the Chief External Examiner in collating the common, programme wide, findings in preparation for their report. During the first 15 minutes of this meeting the Head of ITE, Programme Director, Partnership Director and ITE Programme Manager will be present in order to take any questions and to provide clarification to ensure that any matters raised in the reports are unambiguous and accurate. A further 1 hour will then be available for the External Examiners to have further discussion in order to continue to develop their reports and findings.

The formal meeting of the Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee (APAC) will then follow (the duration of this is approximately 1 hour).

## 6. THE GEOGRAPHY OF OUR PARTNERSHIP

As well as travel time, the size, rurality and transport networks across our partnership present some challenges. However, all of our schools have opportunities to meet with us face to face or virtually (including those in London) and all colleagues are trained and supported in their roles, no matter where they are. All are offered the opportunity to be involved in interviewing prospective trainees and to contribute to the design of the programmes through ITE Coordinator meetings as well as the Strategic Implementation and Planning Group.

In addition to this, School Direct Lead Schools have the opportunity to engage with us remotely through individual Termly Review Meetings.

There are many providers (HEIs, SCITTs and School Direct Lead Schools) that work in our partnership area and many schools work with more than one, which allows us (and the other providers) to compare and learn from each other's good practice whilst maintaining our own uniqueness.

# 7. UNIVERSITY OF EXETER QUALITY REVIEW FRAMEWORK: EXTERNAL EXAMINING

## External Examining (Taught Modules/Programmes)

External Examiners **must** be appointed for all taught programmes delivered by Faculties (or delegated Schools), including Degree Apprenticeships, Postgraduate Research (PGR) Professional Doctorates (taught modules), INTO programmes, and those held with academic partner institutions. The procedures outlined in this document are applicable only to taught programmes of study. The University operates Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees (APAC) as detailed in [Chapter 7 of the Assessment, Progression and Awarding: Taught Programmes Handbook](#). For degree and higher apprenticeship programmes please refer to section 11 of the [Special Provisions for Degree Apprenticeships](#).

### 1. *Criteria for Appointment*

- a. To be appointed as an External Examiner at the University of Exeter, the following criteria **must** be met. Any exceptions to the below criteria must be approved by the Dean for Taught Students, Associate Dean for Taught Students, or Dean of Graduate Research.
- b. The External Examiner's academic/professional qualifications **should** be appropriate in level and subject for examining the programme/s to be examined, and should meet any criteria set out by Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies.
- c. The External Examiner's standing, expertise and experience **should** be such as to enable the fulfilment of the External Examiner's responsibilities. Normally the University would expect such experience to be demonstrated only by those of Senior Lecturer level (or equivalent) status. Where this is not the case, Faculties (or delegated Schools) will be asked to state their reasons for considering the candidate meets the criteria.
- d. The External Examiner **should** have had significant recent examining experience as an internal examiner at the required level.
- e. The External Examiner and University of Exeter department **should** ensure that there is no reciprocal external examining between departments at the University of Exeter and the External Examiner's home department.
- f. The External Examiner **should** not be appointed for any one programme consecutively from the same institution, nor **should** more than one External Examiner be appointed from any one department.
- g. The External Examiner will serve for a period of four years and shall not be re-appointed for the same programme/s without exceptional reason, normally after a period of five years or more has elapsed since their last appointment.
- h. The External Examiner **should** normally not hold more than two External Examining appointments for taught programmes at the same time; this includes their appointment for the University of Exeter.
- i. The External Examiner **should** not be a former member of staff of the University of Exeter, unless there has been a lapse of at least five years. This would normally include honorary staff, members of staff at partner institutions and those who become University employees during their External Examiner appointment.
- j. The External Examiner **should** not have acted as an External Assessor for a programme during the approval process. A Faculty (or delegated School) may apply for an exception to this rule if it can demonstrate to the Dean for Taught Students, Associate Dean for Taught Students, or Dean of Graduate Research that it has taken full account of any potential conflict of interest.
- k. The External Examiner **must** not be registered for an award at the University of Exeter as they are ineligible for appointment as an External Examiner in any part of the University.

- I. The External Examiner **should** not be appointed if they fall within any of the following categories in order to avoid potential conflicts of interest. The Dean for Taught Students, Associate Dean for Taught Students, or Dean of Graduate Research will be responsible for resolving conflicts of interest in the appointment of an External Examiner.
  - They are a Council or Senate member.
  - They have a close professional, contractual or personal relationship with a member of staff or student involved with the programme of study.
  - They have been involved with the supervision of any of the students being examined on placement or professional training.
  - They are in a position to significantly influence the future of students on the programme of study.
  - They are involved in collaborative research activities with a member of staff or anyone who has been directly involved as an external member of the validation panel for the programme.

## 2. **Responsibilities of the University**

The University of Exeter holds the following responsibilities.

- a. At the time of nomination, the Faculty (or delegated School) should **provide** the External Examiner with sufficient information to enable them to make an informed decision as to whether or not to accept the appointment.
- b. Quality and Standards will facilitate the nomination, appointment, provisions of induction information, reporting and subsequent payment of External Examiners.
- c. The Faculty (or delegated School) **should** ascertain whether or not External Examiners have any access requirements or require any reasonable adjustments in order to carry out their duties, as outlined in the University's Equality and Diversity Policy.
- d. The Faculty (or delegated School) will agree the dates of Programme/Discipline/Department APACs and any visits with all External Examiners well in advance of the assessment period.
- e. Where resources permit, Faculties (or delegated Schools) should take the opportunity to invite new External Examiners to the University of Exeter ahead of their first Programme/Discipline/Department APACs to ensure that a Committee meeting is not the first time at which they meet the generality of academic staff.
- f. As a minimum, Faculties (or delegated Schools) **must** provide new External Examiners with the following information by the start of the first session of their appointment:
  - Faculty (or as appropriate) handbook/s or online equivalents.
  - Programme/Discipline/Programme handbooks (or as appropriate).
  - Programme specification/s.
  - Module descriptors (including International Summer School modules).
  - Faculty (or as appropriate) assessment conventions.
  - Previous External Examiner's final report and the Faculty's (or delegated School's) response.
- g. Faculties (or delegated Schools) **must** ensure that specific PSRB (Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body) requirements regarding External Examiners are met. Where required by a PSRB, a programme must appoint multiple External Examiners in order to cover the full range of theory and practice.

## 3. **Responsibilities of the External Examiner**

The role of the external examiner exists to provide independent oversight of the assessment process for the programmes for which they are responsible. They are responsible for checking that assessment is conducted in accordance with University procedures and that marking is consistent with sector-wide standards.

- a. External Examiners are expected to be available, capable, and eligible to undertake the role.
  - a. The External Examiner **should** ensure that they meet the Criteria for Appointment as outlined in section 1. In the event that they do not meet the Criteria for Appointment it **should** be declared immediately so that either an exemption can be granted, or a replacement candidate found.

- b. The External Examiner is responsible to the Senate of the University, in accordance with [Ordinance 3](#).
  - c. The External Examiner agrees that during the appointment they will not hold more than one other external examining appointment for a taught programme unless otherwise agreed by the Dean for Taught Students, Associate Dean for Taught Students, or Dean of Graduate Research in writing in advance.
  - d. The External Examiner agrees that during the appointment they will not undertake any additional activities or accept any other engagements that lead or might lead to any conflict of interest between the External Examiner and the best interests of the University.
  - e. The External Examiner agrees that they will declare to the University any conflict of interest that may arise in the course of the appointment, including in particular if they are placed in a position of making a judgement about any student in whose academic performance, they had a personal interest.
  - f. The External Examiner will ensure that they have sufficient time available to enable them to undertake the duties required of the role.
  - g. The External Examiner agrees to inform the University in good time, of any particular access requirements or any reasonable adjustments needed to enable them to carry out their duties, as outlined in the University's Equality and Diversity Policy.
- b. External Examiners are required to actively engage with the assessment process for the programmes for which they are responsible.
- a. The External Examiner agrees to make themselves familiar with any induction materials provided for their external examiner role and **should** make themselves familiar with the programmes that they will oversee.
  - b. The External Examiner agrees to make themselves familiar with the induction information provided to students.
  - c. The External Examiner is a core member of the Programme/Discipline/Department APAC for the programmes for which they are responsible (see section [7.4.1e of the Assessment, Progression and Awarding: Taught Programmes Handbook](#)).
  - d. They are expected to attend meetings of the Programme/Discipline/Department APAC to which they have been invited.
    - As well as the main Programme/Discipline/Department APAC meeting, external examiners may be invited to preparatory meetings or subsequent meetings that are convened to discuss specific parts of the APAC agenda. However, external examiners are not required to attend these if they are satisfied that the business of those meetings is being conducted appropriately and in accordance with University policy.
    - External examiners are not usually required to attend APACs specifically for the consideration of referred/deferred students, provided that they are satisfied that the business of those meetings is being conducted appropriately and in accordance with University policy.
  - e. Attendance for all participants, including External Examiners, can be online/virtually or in-person/physically, as appropriate to the meeting, including for Referral/Deferral APACs.
  - f. When exceptionally and for good reason, attendance is not possible by any means, the External Examiner's absence must be approved in advance by the Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor for Education or Dean of Graduate Research.
  - g. In accordance with the [APAC Handbook](#), External Examiners can provide written comments instead of being in attendance in an APAC, including Referral/Deferral APACs, provided that, on at least one occasion in the academic year, they attend online/virtually or in-person/physically. This must be agreed in advance by the Chair. This written report must include a record of the External Examiner's remarks and recommendations on classifications and failures, and approve any proposals to scale module marks, and/or changes an individual student's module marks, progression status or award (except when made for the purposes or error correction).

- i. Where absence is necessary to the requirement of attendance on one occasion as noted above, and this absence is known in advance, please see the [APAC Handbook section 7.5](#).
  - ii. Where an absence is unexpected or such submission is not possible before the APAC, please see sections [5.2-5.7](#).
- c. External Examiners review and report on the academic standards of the programme.
- a. The External Examiner is responsible for ensuring that the standard of the University's awards is maintained and is equivalent to threshold academic standards set in accordance with frameworks for higher education qualifications and applicable subject benchmark statements.
  - b. The External Examiner **should** compare the achievements of the University's students with those in other UK higher education institutions of which they have experience.
  - c. The External Examiner has the responsibility for ensuring that each candidate is treated fairly and with an even application of academic standards against the intended outcomes of the programme/s and in line with the University's assessment procedures.
  - d. The External Examiner **must** be satisfied that decisions relating to individual students and scaling of module marks are reached in accordance with agreed regulations.
  - e. The External Examiner **must** be satisfied that the marking of assessments has not been subject to any inappropriate influence or bias. They themselves are also expected to exercise their judgement free from being influenced by any previous association with the programme, the staff, or the student.
  - f. The External Examiner **must** be satisfied that the assessment requirements are such as to enable students to be fairly assessed in relation to programme intended learning outcomes.
    - i. In light of this External Examiners **may** be consulted and asked to provide feedback on changes to assessments.
    - ii. The External Examiner **must** approve the methods of assessment, assessment criteria and feedback processes for all summative assessments which contribute to the final award classification. For assessments delivered within a limited time-frame, during which students have no recourse to immediate academic assistance (i.e., examinations), Externals **should** approve the form and content of prepared questions/tasks. For assessments delivered over a longer timeframe, during which it is possible for students to submit and receive responses to academic enquiries, it is sufficient that Externals review the form of the assessment only.
  - g. The External Examiner has the right to see all summative items of assessment for the modules under their responsibility.
  - i. Typically, a sample of scripts/coursework will be sent, selected according to the following principles:
    - The sample **must** consist of at least 10% or a minimum of 10 (whichever is the greater) of the submitted assessments with the following exceptions:
      - o For stage-one modules which do not count towards final degree classification, Disciplines/Departments may choose to send a smaller sample, provided that the External Examiner is satisfied that they have seen sufficient scripts to be able to report on the academic standards and assessment procedures for the programme stage.
      - o For large modules (typically those with over 300 students) Disciplines/Departments may send a reduced sample, no smaller than 5% or 30 scripts. This **should** be reported to the Faculty APAC.
    - The sample **must** be representative and cover the full range of marks
    - Where possible, the sample should include some scripts that have been internally moderated and some scripts that have not been internally moderate
    - Where possible scripts **should** come from a range of markers if the module has more than one marker
    - Where possible, the sample **should** include at least one item marked according to the marking guidelines for specific learning difficulties
    - The External Examiner **should** be given access to all scripts where possible. However, when an External Examiner has reviewed scripts outside of the identified sample, they should

inform the Education Support Office and identify the scripts they have reviewed.

External examiners are expected to review all assessments sent to them in a sample.

- ii. Where an External Examiner has been given access to all scripts/coursework they are requested to apply the principles above in selecting those for review.
- iii. The External Examiner is entitled to see the marks for all summative assessments contributing to an award made by the APAC of which the External Examiner is a member.
- h. The External Examiner is expected to confirm the decisions taken and awards recommended by the Programme/Discipline/Department APAC verbally in their report to the Board with an appropriate minute made.
  - i. In any case of disagreement which cannot otherwise be resolved, the External Examiner must be consulted, and their views considered by the Chair of the Programme/Discipline/Department APAC, whose decision is final.
- i. The External Examiner, as a condition of appointment and payment, shall be required to submit an annual report in the prescribed manner within four weeks of the main meeting of the Programme/Discipline/Department APAC.
  - i. The External Examiner, where considered appropriate, may send an additional report to the Vice-Chancellor under separate cover marked 'strictly confidential'. If an External Examiner remains concerned having exhausted all internal procedures including a confidential report to the Vice-Chancellor, they may refer to the QAA arrangements for addressing concerns.
- j. For programmes subject to specific requirements by a Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB), additional requirements may be made of External Examiners.
  - i. The External Examiner, where required by a PSRB, **must** observe teaching, learning and/or assessment in the practice environment.
  - ii. The External Examiner, when required by a PSRB, **may** be required to approve applications for accredited prior learning, as per the Learning and Teaching Support Handbook Chapter 16.
- d. **Exclusions to External Examiner Responsibilities**
  - a. The External Examiner is responsible for reviewing the assessment on the programme as a whole, and is not responsible for reviewing individual student pieces of work, except where those items of work form part of a sample of work, and are intended to be indicative of the standard of marking in general.
    - i. The External Examiner is not normally responsible for, or involved in, the assessment of individual students to the extent that they do not carry out marking of assessed work.
    - ii. The External Examiner, in viewing samples of students' assessed work, **should** not expect or encourage a Programme/Discipline/Department APAC to raise or lower marks for individual students, on the basis that such a practice would be unfair to those candidates whose work is not part of the sample.
    - iii. The External Examiner is not expected to be involved in individual cases relating to mitigating circumstances or academic integrity except to ensure that the decisions have been applied fairly and equitably applied. Such decisions are the responsibility of the Mitigation Committee or an Academic Misconduct Panel who will inform the Programme/Discipline/Department APAC of decisions affecting a module result or progression/award decision.
  - b. The External Examiner shall not be expected to act as a second marker.
  - c. The External Examiner shall not be required to act as an External Assessor or Advisor to a programme team on programme design, or be part of any activity established to review



programmes on which he/she examines, except for where they have been appointed separately to that role. Such duties do not form part of the External Examiner role.

- d. The External Examiner is not required to consider formative work or summative work for stages of a programme that do not contribute to the final award.
- e. **Period of Appointment**
- a. In accordance with [Ordinance 5](#), paragraph 3, an External Examiner shall normally be appointed for a maximum of four years. Only under exceptional circumstances shall an External Examiner be appointed for a fifth year. Exceptional arrangements **must** be approved by the Dean for Taught Students, Associate Dean for Taught Students, or Dean of Graduate Research.
- f. **Termination of Appointment**
- a. The University has identified the following circumstances under which the appointment of an External Examiner may be terminated early:
- Failure to attend Programme/Discipline/Department APAC meetings without the prior agreement of the Dean for Taught Students, Associate Dean for Taught Students, or Dean of Graduate Research (acting on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor).
  - Failure to submit an annual report within the specified time.
  - Failure to carry out duties identified in the examiner's contract.
  - Cessation of, or non-recruitment to, the programme/s.
- b. The early termination of the appointment of an External Examiner shall be made by the Dean for Taught Students, Associate Dean for Taught Students, or the Dean of Graduate Research.
- g. **Student Contact with External Examiners**
- a. The contacting of External Examiners by students regarding any aspect of their programmes of study is prohibited and will be treated as an offence under the University's Disciplinary Procedures. External Examiners are requested to inform the University's Quality and Standards team should such an occurrence take place.
- b. An informal meeting between students and the External Examiner may be held at the request of the External Examiner by arrangement by and with the agreement of the Faculty (or delegated School).
- h. **Submission of Reports**
- a. All External Examiners are required to submit an annual report in the prescribed manner within four weeks of the main meeting of the Programme/Discipline/Department APAC.
- b. When compiling the annual report, the External Examiner is expected to comment upon:
- The curriculum, its aims, contents, and development.
  - Resources.
  - The academic standards of the student cohort in relation to that of previous cohorts and other comparable institutions.
  - The quality and standard of provision in relation to comparable institutions.
  - Any issues arising regarding equality and disability.
  - The extent to which standards are appropriate for the award.
  - The design, structure and marking of assessments.
  - Assessment procedures.
  - The level of access to any material needed to make the required judgements.
  - The coherence of policies and procedures relating to External Examiners.
- c. At the end of the report External Examiners are asked to make recommendations for improvement to University processes and for the specific programme examined. Externals are asked to state whether these recommendations are Essential, Advisable or Desirable. The definitions for these criteria are as follows:
- Essential:** Areas of concern which, in your opinion, place academic quality and/or standards at immediate risk and requires an urgent response from the Faculty Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education within two weeks. In the case of the Medical School and Business School, the response may be delegated to the respective Associate Dean for Education.
- Advisable:** Areas of concern regarding threshold standards which, while currently being met, in your opinion, could be significantly improved.
- Desirable:** Areas where, in your opinion there is potential for enhancement.

- d. External Examiner who considers it appropriate may send an additional report to the Vice-Chancellor under separate cover marked 'strictly confidential'. If an External Examiner remains concerned having exhausted all internal procedures including a confidential report to the Vice-Chancellor, they may refer to the QAA arrangements for addressing concerns.
- e. External Examiners' fees and expenses shall not be paid by the University until in receipt of a report.
- i. ***Distribution of Reports***
  - a. Once the annual report has been submitted it will be provided to the Programme Director (or equivalent), Faculty Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education (or equivalent) and the Dean for Taught Students, Associate Dean for Taught Students, or Dean of Graduate Research as appropriate. In the case of validated programmes, copies of reports will also be provided to the nominee of the partner institution. In the case of the Medical School and Business School, the response may be delegated to the respective Associate Dean for Education.
  - b. External Examiner annual reports will be shared with student representatives through Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLC) and **should** not include any reference to an individual student or member of staff by name. Reports are released for requests under the Freedom of Information Act.
- j. ***Response to Reports***
  - a. Faculties (or delegated Schools) are expected to provide a formal response to the recommendations raised in an External Examiner's report. Responses **should** be completed by the Faculty (or delegated School) within 2 weeks of the receipt of the report by the Faculty (or delegated School) for Essential recommendations and within 8 weeks for all other recommendations. Responses must be approved by the Faculty Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education. In the case of the Medical School and Business School, the response may be delegated to the respective Associate Dean for Education.
  - b. Faculty responses will then be approved by the University Dean for Taught Students, Associate Dean for Taught Students, or Dean of Graduate Research, and Faculties will be informed of the outcome within 2 weeks for Essential recommendations and within 8 weeks for all other recommendations.
  - c. Following approval by the Dean for Taught Students, Associate Dean for Taught Students, or Dean of Graduate Research, the External Examiner will be provided with the response to their report.
  - d. As noted above both External Examiner reports and Faculty (or delegated School) responses (or partner institution responses) **should** be shared with student representatives through SSLCs. Faculties (or delegated Schools) are encouraged to formulate their responses through discussion with the SSLC where timing allows. If this is not possible, the response **must** be shared at the next scheduled meeting of the SSLC.
- k. ***Academic Review***
  - a. External Examiner reports on taught programmes are made available to external and internal quality review activities.
- l. ***Monitoring of Reports***
  - a. Responses to all reports will be monitored by Quality and Standards.
  - b. A copy of the External Examiner's report and the Faculty (or delegated School's) response for the previous year should be included early in the agenda of the Programme/Discipline/Department/Faculty's (or delegated School or partner institution's) annual main meeting of the board of examiners, usually their Assessment Progression and Awarding Committee (APAC) meeting.

## 8. EXAMPLE OF EXAMINER ONLINE REPORT FORM

### PGCE EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORT FORM 2023/24

Please note that reports should not include any reference to a student or staff member by name. Reports are shared through Student/Staff Liaison Committees, may be uploaded onto the Exeter Learning Environment (ELE) and must be released under the Freedom of Information Act.

An External Examiner who considers it appropriate may send an additional report to the Vice-Chancellor under separate cover marked 'Strictly Confidential'.

#### Office Information

**1. Title**

- Professor
- Dr
- Mr
- Mrs
- Ms
- Miss
- Other

**2. Alternative Title**

**3. Surname**

**4. Home Institution**

**5. PGCE programme examined**

#### Section 1 :Administration of the Examination Process

**6. The following information was adequate for the purpose of external examining:**

	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither agree or disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Document not received</i>
Programme handbook and documentation for students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme specifications	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme aims, objectives and outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Module descriptions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Details of coursework, teaching and assessment methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**7. The administration of the assessment process was efficient in the following respects:**

	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Neither agree or disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>
Time available for marking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Operation of the Programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assessment, Progressions and Awarding Committee			
Quality of data presented to the Programme Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**8. Is this your first year as an External Examiner for the University of Exeter?**

Yes                       No

**9. Did you have access to reports from previous External Examiners?**

Yes                       No                       Not Applicable

**Section 2 :Academic Standards**

**10. Were the standards of the awards and award elements appropriately set with reference to:**

	Yes	No	Not applicable
National subject benchmarks (where they exist)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The UK Quality Code for Higher Education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Institutional programme specifications and other relevant information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The requirements of Ofsted and any other professional, statutory and other regulatory bodies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**11. Are the stated aims of the programme(s) consistent with:**

	Yes	No
The structure of the award(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The content of the programme(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**12. Are the programmes current and valid?**

Yes                       No

**13. The following aspects of the educational provision are of appropriate quality and standard in relation to comparable universities of which you have experience:**

	Agree	Neither agree	Disagree or disagree
Programme Aims	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme structure and content in relation to the aims	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree programme structure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teaching methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assessment methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Profile of awards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mechanisms for course monitoring and Review	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**14. In your experience, were the standards comparable with previous years?**

- Yes       No       Not applicable

**15. If you had concerns regarding academic standards, what improvements do you consider are necessary?**

**16. The level of student attainment is comparable with that of students in other UK universities, and where appropriate, universities outside the UK, in the following regards:**

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree
Continuous assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Standards of awards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Section 3: Programme Design, Content and Delivery

**17. The curriculum aims, content and development were appropriate**

- Agree       Neither agree or disagree       Disagree

**18. The overall balance of the programme(s) is appropriate**

- Agree       Neither agree or disagree       Disagree

### Section 4: Assessment

**19. Did your duties include consideration of coursework?**

- Yes       No

**20. Did you have access to all the coursework that you needed to see?**

- Yes       No

**21. The level, range, design and structure of the coursework set was satisfactory**

- Agree       Neither agree or disagree       Disagree

**22. Did you receive the marking schemes for assessed work (where used)?**

- Yes       No       Not applicable

**23. The standard of marking and feedback in assessed coursework was satisfactory and consistent**

- Agree       Neither agree or disagree       Disagree

**24. The time allowed for coursework moderation was sufficient**

- Agree       Neither agree or disagree       Disagree

**25. In your opinion, are the academic unit's assessment procedures appropriate?**

**26. Did you attend the Programme Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee meeting?**

Yes  No

**27. In your experience, was the operation of the Programme Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee efficient?**

Yes  No

**28. Were you satisfied with the quality of the documentation received concerning the trainees and their training?**

Yes  No

**29. Were you satisfied with your role in evaluating specific trainee performance?**

Yes  No

**30. In your experience, were all the candidates dealt with fairly and objectively?**

Yes  No

**31. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Programme Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee?**

Yes  No

#### **Section 5: Quality of the Partnership Training Provision of Initial Teacher Training**

**When answering questions in the following sections, please consider your responses within the context of the standards for QTS and ITT Criteria, where appropriate**

**32. Are you satisfied that the quality of partnership provision compares favourably with that of other equivalent institutions?**

Yes  No

**33. Please provide further comments if you wish:**

--

#### **Section 6: Quality of Assessment of Trainees' Competence**

**34. Are you satisfied with the quality of assessment of trainees' competence with regards to the following:**

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree
The quality of documentary evidence of trainees' achievement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The quality of trainees' classroom work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The level, range, design and structure of the coursework set was satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The outcomes of interviews with trainees', school ITT Co-ordinators, Tutors and Mentors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The quality and relevance of the assignments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**35. Are you satisfied with the general quality of the trainees?**

Yes  No

36. Are you satisfied that the overall standard of trainees compares favourably with that of other equivalent institutions?

- Yes  No

37. Are you satisfied with the existing academic, procedural and administrative practices adopted for assessing the quality of trainees' competence?

- Yes  No

38. Please provide further comments if you wish:

#### Section 7: Aspects of Good Practice

39. Please comment on any aspects of good practice in relation to the PGCE programme(s) which should be shared with the University and/or external audiences:

#### Section 8: Recommendations

40. Where applicable, do you feel that the academic unit has made appropriate response to your comments or those made by previous External Examiners?

- Yes  No  Unable to  
Comment

41. Are there any issues that continue to raise concern?

Please state below any areas for improvement for the PGCE programme(s)/module(s):

If there are no areas for improvement please indicate this by typing NONE.

42. **Essential:** Areas of concern which, in your opinion, place academic quality and/or standards at **immediate** risk and requires a response from the Associate Dean for Education **within two weeks**.

43. **Advisable:** Areas of concern regarding threshold standards which, while currently being met, in your opinion, could be significantly improved.

44. **Desirable:** Areas where, in your opinion there is potential for enhancement.

**45. Are there any suggestions for improvements that you wish to make about central University procedures?**

**Section 9: General Comments**

**46. Is this your final year as an External Examiner?**

Yes                       No

**47. Are there any particular observations you would like to make about the programme's development during your period of appointment?**



## 9. GLOSSARY OF TERMS

	<b>Action Plan</b>	Part of the written output from term 1 main subject tutorials. It highlights some of the areas of professional development on which the trainee will have agreed to focus in the weeks immediately following the tutorial.
	<b>Agenda</b>	A teaching Agenda is an essential training tool in the Exeter Model of ITE which follows a Demonstration. It is used for self-evaluation of a specific aspect of professional classroom practice. An Agenda is prepared by making a detailed statement of intent it should have an Agenda statement with a single, clear focus. Once prepared, an observer <i>annotates</i> the Agenda. The annotated Agenda is a basis for detailed written critical evaluation about the chosen aspect of teaching and its effect on pupils' learning.
<b>CfC</b>	<b>Cause for Concern</b>	If a trainee is failing to make satisfactory progress, a Cause for Concern is issued to avoid misunderstanding by any party. A Cause for Concern will be accompanied by a related Action Plan to specify what the trainee needs to do to make progress and how this will be supported.
	<b>Demonstration</b>	This involves the setting up of a classroom activity, strategy, tactic, event or interaction by a subject tutor, which is shared and discussed with the trainee before the event. When the demonstration occurs, the trainee is prepared, so observation and understanding is more sophisticated. Items for demonstration should be negotiated and identified by the trainee and Lead and Reflective Mentors. Demonstration can be thought of as: "This is what I am going to do and this is why I am going to do it like this".
	<b>Episode</b>	A part of a lesson identified for formal attention. It can be as short as a few minutes or relate to separate parts of a lesson in which a specific skill of teaching is being addressed by using an Agenda.
<b>FSR</b>	<b>Final Summative Report</b>	A document on which indicates whether the trainee has met the Teachers' Standards at a level suitable for the award of QTS
<b>FRAP</b>	<b>Formative Reflection on Achievement and Progress (AP FRAP, BP FRAP, CP FRAP and DI FRAP)</b>	These are formative reports of the trainee's progress. They signpost evidence of meeting each phase (Anticipating Practice, Beginning Practice BP, Consolidating Practice CP, Developing Independence DI) and allows the trainee to reflect on their progress.
	<b>Exeter Model Framework</b>	This indicates a number of influences which bear upon and may affect trainees' planning, teaching and assessment. Its purpose is to encourage critical conversation about trainees' classroom practice and to support them in the process of reflective evaluation.
<b>IDP</b>	<b>Individual Development Portfolio</b>	This is an online portfolio which records progress and achievement and identifies training needs through the PGCE year. It will include copies of all the key documentation relating to individuals' training.
	<b>Initial Needs Analysis</b>	Various assessments of prior knowledge in order to inform future development needs.
<b>ITEC</b>	<b>ITE Coordinator</b>	Designated teacher responsible for managing the school's involvement in ITE, supervising provision for trainees, overseeing the administration of school-based work and liaising with the School of Education through the Partnership Office.
<b>ITEPO</b>	<b>ITE Partnership Office</b>	University-based colleagues responsible for administration and management of school-based work.
<b>LM</b>	<b>Lead Mentor</b>	Teachers who work alongside the trainee in the classroom. On the secondary programme the Lead Mentor also coordinates the work of the trainee in the subject department.
<b>MoU</b>	<b>Memorandum of Understanding</b>	The Partnership Agreement between the School and the University, detailing responsibilities. (With School Direct lead schools this is called the Partnership Agreement rather than the MoU.)
	<b>PGCE to Early Career Framework Transition Document</b>	A transition document completed towards the end of the course outlining trainees' achieved competences and areas for further professional development during their ECT years to pass to their employing school.

	<b>Phase</b>	The Exeter Model for Initial Teacher Education is developmental. Five phases of progression are recognised in the PGCE programme: <b>Anticipating Practice, Beginning Practice, Consolidating Practice, Developing Independence and Extension and Enrichment.</b>
	<b>Profile Descriptor</b>	The Profile Descriptors describe what trainees are expected to have an opportunity to learn during each phase of the course. They are formatively assessed during each phase.
	<b>Reflective Conversation</b>	A planned meeting between a trainee and the Reflective Mentor at which the trainee's progress is discussed and trainee reflection encouraged. In general, one or more annotated Agendas and the FRAP will provide material for discussion.
<b>RM</b>	<b>Reflective Mentor</b>	School-based teacher from another subject area in secondary, or class in primary, who helps the trainee to reflect critically on his/her own performance, through individual Reflective Conversations held three times each term.
<b>SBW</b>	<b>School Based Work</b>	When trainees are on placement.
<b>SD</b>	<b>School Direct</b>	Trainees following a school led programme with the University of Exeter. There are two routes - '@Exeter' and 'Distance'.
	<b>Seminar Day</b>	University-based day during school-based work enabling trainees to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identify and critically evaluate issues which emerge from practice in school, through reflective discussions with peers and tutors</li> <li>• broaden their understanding of how theory links with practice</li> </ul>
<b>TSP</b>	<b>Trainee Support Plan</b>	Action plan for when the trainee is in need of some additional support to meet a short term target or to overcome a short term problem. If targets on the TSP are not met then a Cause for Concern Action Plan would be issued.
<b>UVT</b>	<b>University Visiting Tutor</b>	The university tutor who has direct contact with the trainee and school. A UVT normally makes one visit per term (spring and summer) during School-Based Work. School Direct Distance trainees have a visit in the autumn term in addition to the visits in the spring and summer.
<b>WDM</b>	<b>Weekly Development Meeting</b>	A planned weekly meeting between the trainee and Lead Mentor to review and evaluate the progress made in the preceding week and to plan and set targets for the forthcoming week. Outcomes are recorded on the Weekly Development Meeting Record.
<b>WDMR</b>	<b>Weekly Development Meeting Record</b>	Written account of the weekly development meeting in the IDP

# 10. FAILURE AND CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE PROCEDURES FOR TRAINEES ON PGCE PROGRAMMES

## THE AWARD OF QTS

The award of QTS is based on meeting the Teachers' Standards and is, therefore, on a pass or fail basis only. The trainee curriculum is based on phases – Anticipating Practice (AP), Beginning Practice (BP), Consolidating Practice (CP), Developing Independence (DI) and an optional phase of Extension and Enrichment. The profile descriptors state the declarative and procedural knowledge that trainees should know and be able to demonstrate in order to meet the expectations of each phase.

Trainees complete a Formative Reflection on Achievement and Progress (FRAP) at the end of each phase, using the phase and route specific Profile Descriptor to guide their reflections and evidence. Trainees have a final deadline for each phase. When trainees don't meet the expectations of the phase by the deadline, they are issued with a Cause for Concern Action Plan which outlines what they still need to do to meet the phase.

The **Final Summative Report (FSR)** is issued towards the end of the course and indicates whether or not a trainee has evidence of achievement of the Developing Independence phase, and therefore the Teachers' Standards so that a Pass for school-based work can be recommended to the final awarding committee. If the FSR indicates that a trainee has not achieved the expectations of the Developing Independence phase, they should continue to work on the areas identified in their Cause for Concern Action Plan so that they can continue to evidence progress during the last few weeks of the course.

## SUPPORTING STRUGGLING TRAINEES

Each year there will be trainees who for various reasons struggle to achieve the Teachers' Standards for the Award of QTS.

The first principle of dealing with struggling or weak trainees is to help them succeed in achieving the Standards. Trainees struggle for many reasons, some personal and some contextual, and we know from years of following trainees' career trajectories that weaker trainees do not necessarily become weak teachers. Many become strong, confident practitioners and curriculum leaders as their confidence and understanding grows.

The second principle of dealing with weak or struggling trainees is that we must maintain rigorous standards and assessment procedures and must not allow trainees to pass who are not demonstrating the appropriate level of competence.

There are many types of support available for trainees who are struggling to make progress and colleagues are advised to signpost them to appropriate support services such as Wellbeing, AccessAbility, RERO (the School of Education Race Equality Resource Officer) and Students' Guild where appropriate. If the Exeter Occupational Health Service has advised adjustments or recommendations it is also important to ensure that these are in place wherever it is feasible.

### Issuing a Trainee Support Plan or Cause For Concern Action Plan

Some trainees benefit from targeted support, particularly if they have been absent for several days or have a recurring target on their Weekly Development Meeting record. The **Trainee Support Plan (TSP)** is a short term action plan, lasting for a maximum of two weeks, which describes what needs to be done and what additional support is going to be put in place to help them to achieve this.

The additional support will normally be resource neutral and might include things such as opportunities to observe additional demonstrations, direction towards further reading, teaching from existing lesson plans, joint lesson planning or team teaching etc.

The Trainee Support Plan is drawn up by the University Visiting Tutor (UVT) and Lead Mentor in discussion with the trainee. At the end of the specified time frame the Lead Mentor and UVT evaluates the targets against the evidence and if they have been met the TSP is concluded. If they have not been met then the trainee's progress will be a cause for concern and the Cause for Concern (CfC) process should be initiated.

- A TSP will not normally be used for issues of professionalism as these are an immediate cause for concern and will be addressed through that process.
- A TSP cannot be issued less than two weeks before the Developing Independence (DI) FRAP deadline. Any such issues occurring then will indicate a concern about achieving the Teachers' Standards and so a CfC Action Plan will be issued.
- A Cause for Concern Action Plan can be issued without a preceding TSP and for any reason, including absence.

A **Cause for Concern Action Plan (CfC)** may be issued if a trainee is failing to make expected progress at any stage during their training. The CfC identifies concerns about their progress under the following four headings and sets a supportive and constructive action plan with targets that are related to the Standards and are **Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-related**:

- Absence of more than 10 days from the programme
- Failure to meet deadlines for university directed tasks or assignments
- Insufficient progress for the stage of the course
- Professional engagement with the course

The CfC is usually issued by either:

- the University Personal Tutor (during university-based work)
- the Lead Mentor and University Visiting Tutor (UVT) jointly (during School-based work).

The final deadline for issue of a CfC is the Developing Independence Formative Reflection on Achievement and Progress (DI FRAP) submission deadline and is set to give trainees enough time to address the concerns and to improve before the Final Summative Report.

**However, should issues come to light for the first time after this deadline a trainee can still be issued with a CfC and so fail to reach the Teachers' Standards.**

## EXAMINING PROCEDURES

If the Final Summative Report indicates that a trainee has not met the Developing Independence phase the trainee is designated as a potential fail trainee and appropriate examination procedures is put in place. An Internal Moderation Visit is carried out by a member of university staff who was not the trainee's UVT or Personal Tutor and a Moderation Visit Report form is completed.

The Developing Independence phase descriptor exceeds the minimum knowledge required by the Teachers' Standards. The moderator assesses whether the trainee has met the Teachers' Standards rather than the higher threshold of the Developing Independence phase descriptor. Those who have not met the Teachers' Standards are not recommended for QTS and therefore fail the course. Those who demonstrate they have met the Teachers' Standards pass the course and any developmental targets are added to their PGCE to Early Career Framework Transition Document.

The role undertaken by the **External Examiners** is to investigate the moderation visit documentation containing the evidence of the trainee's progress; to confirm that the documentation demonstrates the decision and that the process leading to this has been followed and to consider whether this decision-making is equitable across the programme.

**The Primary/Secondary External Examiners** undertake examination of the programme by:

- reading the Moderation Visit Report, Developing Independence Formative Reflection on Achievement and Progress report (DI FRAP), Cause for Concern Action Plan(s) and Final Summative Report (FSR) and most recent UVT visit records for any trainees receiving a moderation visit. They will be asked to form a judgement about whether the documentation provided supports the decisions made.

**The Chief External Examiners** undertake examination of the programme by:

- reading the Moderation Visit Report, Developing Independence Formative Reflection on Achievement and Progress report (DI FRAP), Cause for Concern Action Plan(s) and Final Summative Report (FSR) for a

selection of trainees receiving a moderation visit across the programme to form a judgement about whether the decisions made are equitable across the programme.

## **FACULTY LEVEL APAC AND RESIT OPPORTUNITIES**

The Faculty level APAC is presented with trainees who fit one of three categories:

- Trainees who have failed the PGCE due to failed assignments
- Trainees have failed the PGCE due to failure to meet the Teachers' Standards for the Award of QTS
- Trainees who have failed the PGCE in both the above respects

### **Resubmission of assignments**

Where trainees have failed due to submission of failed assignments, the decision of the Faculty level APAC should be to allow resubmission by a specified date (normally during the August/September following the APAC).

### **School Placement Resit opportunity**

Where trainees have failed to meet the Teachers' Standards for the Award of QTS a resit opportunity may be offered.

A resit opportunity is not an automatic entitlement but if offered, trainees will be given one opportunity to undertake a further ten week placement.

The circumstances in which a trainee would be refused a resit opportunity are:

- the trainee would be a danger to children
- the trainee's classroom/behaviour management is so unsatisfactory that serious disruptive problems in the classroom are likely to arise
- the trainee's progress towards achieving the Standards is demonstrably so limited that a 10-week additional placement is deemed to be insufficient to enable achievement of the Standards
- the trainee has withdrawn from school-based work
- the trainee has absented themselves from the programme without leave
- *a concern has been raised about a trainee's fitness to practise and the case has been referred to the University of Exeter Fitness to Practise procedures. Until there is a decision from this panel the Faculty APAC will not make a re-sit decision.*

Where a trainee's progress towards achieving the Standards is demonstrably so limited that a 10 week additional placement is deemed insufficient to enable achievement of the Standards, this is likely to be evidenced through the Formative Reflection on Achievement and Progress (FRAP), FSR and CfC documentation. The information provided in the Moderation Visit Report will also be used to inform this decision. A decision not to allow a resit opportunity will therefore be based on evidence from across the training year rather than exclusively based on performance in the final placement.

It is the Faculty level APAC's role to determine whether a resit opportunity would not be in the best interests of either the trainee or partnership schools. In cases of doubt the resit opportunity should be allowed.

The length of the resit opportunity is ten weeks. This is non-negotiable. It is important that trainees who have failed have the right to a placement of sufficient length to demonstrate that they can meet the Standards in a sustained way and that they have sufficient time to establish relationships with new classes and develop medium term planning. For the sake of parity and to maintain standards and partnership relationships with schools, the placement cannot be extended beyond the ten weeks.

The resit opportunity should usually be in a different placement school to those already experienced in order to ensure total fairness for the trainee and to avoid judgments being influenced by previous practice. It must be in a partnership school.

The trainee should be notified of the decision of the Faculty level APAC informally by their university tutor promptly after the APAC has been held and the decision should be followed up in writing by the ITE Programme Manager. Where a repeat placement opportunity is being offered the letter should include details of the timescale, the cost of the repeat placement and the procedure the trainee should follow to request a repeat placement.