

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**  
**ACADEMIC YEAR: 2012– 2013**

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

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Faculty / School of:          | HCES   |
| Subject(s):                   | Midwifery  |
| Programme(s) / Module(s):     | Postgraduate : HECS 3191<br>HECS 5224M, HECS 5225M, HECS 5012M                 |
| Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc): | MSc, Postgraduate Certificate in the care of Critically Ill Childbearing Women |

**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](mailto:exexadmin@leeds.ac.uk).

Alternatively you can post your report to: **Head of Academic Quality and Standards**  
Academic Quality and Standards Team  
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*

**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?*

I was asked to be external examiner for the Postgraduate provision indicated above, on an interim basis. I was not provided with previous external examiners reports.

**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.*

Yes

**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.*

Yes

**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.*

Assessment standards are good, with the processes of marking and internal moderation explicit.

I think the methods of assessment are appropriate to learning outcomes although presentations and vivas difficult to externally moderate as involve verbal discussion. The student performance overall in all modules externally moderated would suggest a good standard of teaching. Is it usual practice to invite the external examiner to such assessments or video /audible record these?

**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.*

All successful students demonstrated appropriate academic writing abilities and work commensurate with Masters level, although several students weak on abilities to critically analyse the evidence base which underpins practice issues in HECS 5224.

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

**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.*

As reviewing these modules on a short term basis, unable to comment .

**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.*

Research evidence explicit throughout all the modules reviewed and students encouraged to integrate this into theoretical assessments.

**For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements**

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

**The Examination/Assessment Process**

**9. 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

**10. 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

**11. 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?**

No. Due to the temporary nature of my involvement in Postgraduate modules indicated previously, I was only aware of the assessments when completed work sent for external moderation.

**12. 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

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

N/A

**14. 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?**

Administrative processes satisfactory. I was unable to attend Board of Examiners meeting .

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

**Other comments**

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

School of Healthcare

Baines Wing  
University of Leeds  
Leeds LS2 9JT



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

17 March 2014

Dear

**Re: External Examiner's Report – 2012/2013**

Thank-you for your annual report for the Postgraduate Certificate in the Care of the Critically Ill Woman. It is pleasing to see that you consider that the programme aims and intended learning outcomes are of the standard expected for this level of study.

Your positive comments on the standard of student achievement and robustness of the assessment are welcomed by the team. The team is committed to providing students with appropriate feedback in order to help them improve in future assessment. All teaching is evidence based and it is pleasing to see that you consider that research evidence was explicit throughout all the modules that you reviewed. Some students, as you note, do find critical analysis challenging and these students have been offered support via academic supervision and the opportunity to attend study days on writing at postgraduate level run by the Library.

The team apologises that you did not receive the previous external examiner's report for this programme, which should have been sent to you along with the assessment schedule. In response to your comments regarding oral presentations, external examiners are invited to attend, wherever possible, or alternatively these can be recorded on request. Although you did not have the opportunity to review draft assessments and marking criteria for the examinations due to the short-term nature of your external examinership in relationship to this programme, the team assures me that these were reviewed by the previous external examiner.

May I take this opportunity to thank-you for your positive report and the support you offered the team during the last year. The team considered it a pleasure to work with you and greatly appreciated the support you gave them during the short tenure of your appointment.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely

Head of School of Healthcare



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE