

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR: 2013-2014

Part A: General Information**Subject area and awards being examined**

| | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Faculty / School of: | Faculty of Biological Sciences |
| Subject(s): | <i>Anatomy</i> |
| Programme(s) / Module(s): | Anatomy in Relation to Medicine |
| Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc): | BSc |

Name and home Institution / affiliation of Examiner**Completed report**

The completed report should be attached to an e-mail and sent as soon as possible, and no later than six weeks after the relevant meeting of the Board of Examiners, to exexadmin@leeds.ac.uk.

Alternatively you can post your report to: **Head of Quality Assurance**
Room 12:81, EC Stoner Building
The University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT

Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards**Matters for Urgent Attention**

If there are any areas which you think require urgent attention before the programme is offered again please note them in this box

None

Only applicable in first year of appointment

Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?

Yes

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

Please comment on your experience of the programme(s) over the period of your appointment, remarking in particular on changes from year to year and the progressive development and enhancement of the learning and teaching provision, on standards achieved, on marking and assessment and the procedures of the School

Standards

1. Please indicate the extent to which the programme Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) were commensurate with the level of the award

- *The appropriateness of the Intended Learning Outcomes for the programme(s)/modules and of the structure and content of the programme(s);*
- *The extent to which standards are appropriate for the award or award element under consideration.*

Suitable with respect to both

2. Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?

- *The comparability of the programme(s) with similar programme(s) at other institutions and against national benchmarks and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications.*

As far as I am aware there is no benchmark for 'science' anatomy; however the aims and ILOs address parts of the GMC "Tomorrow's Doctors (2009)". This is perhaps appropriate as the programme is taken by intercalating medical students.

3. Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs

- *The design and structure of the assessment methods, and the arrangements for the marking of modules and the classification of awards;*
- *The quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods that may be indicated by student performance.*

The design and structure of the assessment methods is appropriate and transparent, with the quality of teaching being very good.

4. Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the Aims and ILOs?

- *The academic standards demonstrated by the students and, where possible, their performance in relation to students on comparable courses;*
- *The strengths and weaknesses of the students as a cohort.*

Yes.

The student cohort is a preselected group of medical students who have taken the opportunity to intercalate to gain greater insight to the basic sciences (anatomy) underpinning medicine. As such they are a very good group.

5. For Examiners responsible for programmes that include clinical practice components, please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum

N/A

6. Please comment on the nature and effectiveness of enhancements to the programme(s) and modules since the previous year

It would be particularly helpful if you could also identify areas of good practice which are worthy of wider dissemination.

I was particularly impressed by the high level of dissection skills displayed in the Clinical Anatomy Projects. It is clear that considerable thought has gone into the design and assessment of this module, as well as the provision of appropriate resources to support the work undertaken.

7. Please comment on the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching

This may include examples of curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research.

The ethos of the Clinical Anatomy Projects requires students to research the literature pertaining to the area/topic of the project: consequently as well as studying the anatomy underlying specific clinical/surgical conditions/approaches students have to be aware of developments and outcomes in related research.

8. Where the programme forms part of an Integrated PhD, please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD

N/A

For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements

9. If you have acted as a mentor to a new External Examiner or have received mentor support please comment here on the arrangements

N/A

The Examination/Assessment Process

10. The University and its Schools provide guidance for External Examiners as to their roles, powers and responsibilities. Please indicate whether this material was sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner.

Whether External Examiners have sufficient access to the material needed to make the required judgements and whether they are encouraged to request additional information.

Yes

11. Did you receive appropriate documentation relating to the programmes and/or parts of programmes for which you have responsibility, e.g. programme specifications or module handbooks, marking criteria?

The coherence of the policies and procedures relating to External Examiners and whether they match the explicit roles they are asked to perform.

Yes

12. Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments? Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate? If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

Yes

13. Was sufficient assessed / examined work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work? Were the scripts clearly marked/annotated?

Yes

14. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate? Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

Yes: I thought the topics entirely appropriate having a clear clinical perspective. I particularly like the assessment of the dissertations, these being an assessment of the dissection, assessment of the project report and a seminar presentation.

15. Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Board of Examiners? Were you able to attend the meeting? Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board?

Yes, the arrangement for meeting of the Examination Board were satisfactory. I was able to attend the board meeting and concurred with the recommendations for each degree classification put forward. Prior to the board meeting I was able to discuss the situation of a particular student who presented with mitigating circumstances.

16. Were appropriate procedures in place to give due consideration to mitigating circumstances and medical evidence?

Yes

Other comments

Please use this box if you wish to make any further comments not covered elsewhere on the form

After accepting the appointment I learnt that the 'anatomy' was transferring to the School of Medicine and with it the intercalated degree programme. This will result in the intercalating year having a much more focussed anatomical content, which I wholeheartedly support.

I visited the University on 12 March 2014 during which time I reviewed the semester 1 modules and course work. At this visit I also had the opportunity to meet with students. A range of topics were discussed; however it was clear that they were a highly motivated group who were intercalating because they (i) enjoyed anatomy, and (ii) wished to gain a better understanding of anatomy to underpin their future clinical/surgical careers. Other positive aspects commented on were: more independent learning; different methods of assessment; the clinical projects; learning information in different ways; video lectures, which they could review several times; and the order and presentation of lecture.

The students were aware that that content of the programme was changing next year and welcomed this: the programme will have a more focussed anatomical content. The only concern expressed with this change was that as a group they would no longer have the interaction with other groups of students, i.e. non-medical students.

The course team are to be commended on providing a stimulating programme.

Faculty of Biological Sciences
Student Education Service

Student Education Office
Irene Manton Building
University of Leeds
Leeds
LS2 9JT, UK



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

30 September 2014

Dear

RESPONSE TO EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT 2013/14
BSc Anatomy in Relation to Medicine

Thank you for your External Examiner's report regarding our intercalated anatomy programme. The programme team is delighted to read your positive comments on the programme.

As you mention in your report, the programme is changing for 2014/15. The programme team is excited to be offering a new complement of modules that will be taught entirely by anatomy staff and have a genuinely anatomical basis.

The Clinical Anatomy project module, on which you commented positively, will continue in the new programme, retaining the same format as before. We expect that our appointment of a new lecturer from the University of Dundee will strengthen this element of the programme further by adding a new dimension to the projects that we are able to offer.

Hopefully, the students taking the new programme will have the same enthusiastic feeling about their studies as the current cohort. It is not clear to us how much they will miss contact with the non-medical students, if at all, given that they will have never experienced it during their medical studies. We will be monitoring their opinions very carefully on all matters relating to our new provision and will hopefully have a better view of any areas in need of improvement in 12 months time.

The programme team is also pleased that you found the administrative arrangements supporting both the programme and your activities as External Examiner satisfactory. Credit for these aspects goes, of course, to staff in the Faculty of Biological Sciences Undergraduate Office. We are all hopeful that these high standards will be maintained in future and that the transition from one support team to another can be made smoothly and without problem.

Finally let me thank you on behalf of the programme team for all your work as External Examiner over this year. We are looking forward to working with you over the coming years as our new programme beds in and develops further.

Kind regards,