

View results

Respondent
91 Anonymous

44:12
Time to complete

Part A - External Examiner Details

1. Name of External Examiner: *

Rev Dr Carlton J Turner

2. External Examiner's home institution (or other affiliation): *

The Queen's Foundation for Ecumenical Theological Education

3. Programme/Disciplines examined: *

Congregational Federation institute for Practical Theology

4. **Fees For External Examiners appointed prior to 1 June 2024:**

In addition to your basic fee, a capitation fee will also be made per module per student.

For this payment, please list the module code(s) and title(s) below that you examined this academic year (please liaise with your PASS Administrator if you need this information):

Fees For External Examiners appointed from 1 June 2024 onwards:

External Examiners appointed from 1 June 2024 onwards will receive a set fee for one programme (further fees may apply for any additional programme(s) within the same subject area). Please list the module(s) codes that you examined this academic year: *

- Module A (VCF4009M - level 4) – The Bible and the People of God
- Module B (4XCFBB - Level 4) - History of Christian Life and Thought
- Module J (VCF5010M - Level 5) – Congregational History and Principals
- Module E9 (VCF4013M)– To Be a Pilgrim
- Module E5 (VCF4009M) – Dancing Elephants: Preparing for Preaching
- Module F (VCF4002M) – Exploring Christian Service (only handbook)
- Module G (VCF4006M) – Christian Ethics
- Module I (VCF5018M) – Ethical Dialogues
- Module J (VCF5010M) Resubmissions – Christian History and Principals
- Module O6 (VCF5020M) – Sing to the Lord a New Song: Prayers and Psalms in the Life of the Church
- Module O7 (VCF5021M) – Thinking Theologically
- Module Y (VCF5014M) – Contextual Mission

5. YSJU School: *

- York Business School
- School of Arts
- School of Science, Technology & Health
- School of Humanities
- School of Education, Languages & Psychology
- School of London

6. Place(s) of Delivery (if not YSJU):

Nottingham

7. Level of Study: *

Undergraduate

Postgraduate

8. Date of Submission: *

29/08/2024

Part B - Full Report

Please note there is a word limit of 300 words for each section.

Please complete all sections of the report.

9. Academic Standards of Awards *

Please indicate to what extent you agree that the University is maintaining the threshold academic standards set for its awards in accordance with the frameworks for higher education qualifications, relevant subject benchmark statements and professional standards where appropriate.

Strongly Agree Somewhat Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Strongly Disagree

10. Academic Standards of Awards *

Please elaborate on your response above. Please also include references to evidence (e.g. programme specifications, assessment tasks) where appropriate.

Generally, this is a very well organised programme that ensures high quality standards in teaching and assessment. The courses above are generally focused and well designed, and grounded in the principles of Practical Theology. They are very well administered, and I, personally, found them engaging. All modules seen were clearly introduced and handbooks laid out clearly for the students what the expectations are in terms of assessments and marking. There is consistency across modules that further ground the overall aims and objectives of the Foundation Degree.

11. Assessment Processes *

Please indicate to what extent you agree that the assessment process measures student achievement rigorously and fairly against the intended outcomes of the programme(s), including professional requirements where appropriate, and is conducted in line with the institution's policies and regulations.

Strongly Agree Somewhat Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Strongly Disagree

12. Assessment Processes *

Please elaborate on your response above. Please include references to any supporting evidence (e.g. programme specifications, assessment tasks, evidence from the conduct of School Assessment Boards (SABs) where appropriate.

You may wish to comment specifically on the operation of the SAB.

I received relevant University, Programme, and Module documentation as a Teams folder with sub-folders and relevant files. In these documents I have received access to handbooks, student submissions, Tutor moderation forms showing discussions between first and second markers, and reports of overall module marks. Samples and documents were consistent across modules and overall reports and tutor moderation were present and accessible. Further information, explanation and guidance were shared by email and CF were more than happy to assist with any queries. Sufficient samples of coursework were made available. I was given enough information and guidance to gain a sense of the programme, the standard of modules, and the consistency of marking. Furthermore, tutor feedback is generally clear and instructive. Feedback depth and style vary across modules, but generally, the practice is to both identify weaknesses and to affirm strengths. Tutors, both first and second markers, give feedback that help student improvement and learning. First and Second markers disagreed in a number of places. The recorded conversations about discrepancies are well evidenced and there is clear rationale for mark adjustments. CF continues to hold high standards for assessment.

13. Student Achievement *

Please indicate to what extent you agree that the academic standards and the achievements of students are comparable with those other UK higher education institutions of which you have experienced.

Strongly Agree Somewhat Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Strongly Disagree

14. Student Achievement *

Please elaborate on your response above.

Assessments are generally wide ranging and, where necessary, appropriate for the nature of the module. It was good to see that assessments included essays, case-studies, individual presentations, project reports, self-reflections, and others. This is something that is consistent with my own institution and others that I have been part of.

15. Student Achievement *

Where appropriate, comment on the comparability of standards and the achievements of students across different modes of learning (e.g. by both traditional delivery and by distance learning or e-learning) and/or across different sites.

CF attracts a mixed and unpredictable cohort of students, who generally fulfill the the learning outcomes of the various modules. I quired an initial observation I made that across modules students' names that seemly from other ethnicities tended to do less well in module marks. This was discussed at exam boards, and it was cleary not the case as upon further examination, marks varied across components and followed no such identifiable patter. CF had been thinking about this, but also held discussions about this subsequently, determining the need to look at support needs at the start of the academic programme. I'm happy that there is an active conversation about this and commend them for being proactive.

Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Strategy

In support of our Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Strategy and our focus on continuous improvement, we would welcome your observations on good practice, innovation or opportunities for further enhancement in the following areas:

- **Course design**
- **Teaching**
- **Assessment**
- **Academic support**
- **Learning resource**
- **Student voice**
- **Belonging and community**
- **Social justice**

16. Please comment on any good practice in reference to the areas identified above. *

The programme that CF offers is well desinged and administered. What continues to be excellent is the active inclusion of Non-White, Non-Western scholarship in the list of resources. This seems to be an embedded practice and is evidenced across modules. Also, the course is also geared towards real life contexts and is organised and assessed in this regard. I find this commendable and quite a good model for similar programmes generally.

17. Please comment on any improvements over the last academic year, in reference to the areas identified above. *

What CF offers remains a programme of high quality. The improvement on last year is the active search for further support with academic skills for students who might be struggling.

18. Please comment on any opportunities for further enhancement of the quality of the areas identified above. *

I am satisfied with what is in place.

19. Have issues raised in previous report(s) been addressed to your satisfaction? *

Yes, the aforementioned issue of extra support for students doing less well has been addressed to my satisfaction.

20. Please provide the details of any visits you have undertaken during the year.

N/A

21. Have you undertaken a mentor role for a new external examiner this year? If so, have you completed your summary report for the year?

No

22. Please use this box to address any matters not fully covered elsewhere on this form (e.g. requirements of professional, statutory or regulatory bodies).

N/A

23. **For external examiners completing a term of office.**
Please use this box to provide an overview of your term of office.

N/A

PART C - Professional, Statutory, Regulatory Body (PSRB) Requirements

To be completed by External Examiners responsible for PSRB related awards

24. Please comment on how effectively PSRB requirements are met by the programme, commenting specifically on relevant professional issues such as fitness to practice.

N/A

PART D - Apprenticeship Requirements

To be completed by External Examiners responsible for Apprenticeship related awards

25. Please comment on how effectively apprenticeship requirements are met by the programme. Please comment specifically on how effective feedback is on the programme, and whether it is meaningful and helps the student to improve.

N/A

Part E - Appendix to the External Examiner Report - Checklist

26. Programme Materials *

Did you have access to:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme handbook(s)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Programme regulations (these may be in the programme handbook)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Module descriptions (these may be in the programme handbook)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assessment briefs/ marking criteria?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

27. Please use the box below to clarify any of your responses where necessary:

28. Draft Examination Papers *

	Yes	No	N/A
Did you receive all the draft papers?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If not, was this at your request?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

29. Please use the box below to clarify any of your responses where necessary:

30. **Marking Examination Scripts** *

	Yes	No	N/A
Did you have access to a sufficient number of scripts?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If you did not have access to all the scripts, was the method of selection satisfactory?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

31. Please use the box below to clarify any of your responses where necessary:

32. **Dissertation/Project Reports** *

	Yes	No	N/A
Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

33. Please use the box below to clarify any of your responses where necessary:

34. **Coursework/continuously assessed work** *

	Yes	No	N/A
Was sufficient coursework made available to you for assessment?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

35. Please use the box below to clarify any of your responses where necessary:

36. Administration *

	Yes	No	N/A
Were you provided with adequate guidance as to your role, duties and responsibilities	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Were you provided with copies of previous external examiners' reports (applicable in your first year)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Did the report form allow you to report fully on your role?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

37. Please use the box below to clarify any of your responses where necessary:

38. Question

- Option 1
- Option 2

39. Question

40. Question

 