

## The University of Leeds

### EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2010– 2011

#### PART A: GENERAL INFORMATION

*Subject area and awards being examined:*

<b>School of:</b> Leeds Institute of Health Sciences <b>Programme(s) / Module(s):</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Foundations of International Health NUFF5315M</li> <li>2. Principles of Hospitals Management NUFF5335M</li> <li>3. Hospital Experience Attachment NUFF5950M</li> <li>4. Human Resources Planning and Management for Health NUFF5435M</li> <li>5. Management of Finance for Health NUFF5460M</li> <li>6. Health Systems Research Methods NUFF5710M</li> <li>7. Quality Improvement in Health care NUFF5000M</li> <li>8. Dissertation Literature Review NUFF5630M</li> <li>9. DissertationNUFF5630M</li> </ol>	<b>Subject(s):</b> Hospital Management <b>awards: (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc.)</b> MA
---	---

The completed report should be attached to an e-mail and sent as soon as possible, and no later than 6 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.*

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?*

No

##### ***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.*

The assessment questions and the case studies were excellent and reflected the indicative contents and the learning outcomes in the Module Guides. The assessments met all the learning outcomes at higher level.

**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.*

The level of assessment is very appropriate and compares very favourably with higher education institutions offering similar courses. There is a fit between learning outcomes at both module and course level and assessment strategies. The standards met by students on this course are comparable with those across the sector.

**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 assessment methods reflected the ways in which diversity and the needs of international learners were taken into account in the teaching, learning and assessment of the modules. A range of different assessment methods have been chosen by lecturers in relation to fitness for award and for their validity, reliability, fairness, feasibility, and for their potential to promote learning and the application of theory to practice in the particular context of hospital management.

**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.*

The assessment information suggests that the students were given appropriate, guidance and support in meeting the learning outcomes, in preparation for and completing their assignments.

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

Not applicable

**6. 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.*

This is my first year as an external examiner for the programme.

**7. 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 curriculum reflects current changes in the knowledge, understanding and skills to deliver the hospital management course. The programme focuses on health care in developing countries so that the course does not take on an NHS management brief which may not be valid in the context of the students as

future managers. Although the NHS offers a good source of management examples the course team will endeavour to apply any lessons learned from the NHS into the global context.

### **The Examination Process**

8. **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.*

The necessary information was sent to me on my appointment. Continuing update information from the Programme Coordinators and access to The University website for further information were very helpful.

9. **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?**

- *The coherence of the policies and procedures relating to external examiners and whether they match the explicit roles they are asked to perform.*

Yes. All relevant information was sent to me on my appointment as an External Examiner. Also, I was referred to The University website to download additional information if required.

10. **Was sufficient assessed/examination work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?**

Yes. All examination papers that were mailed to me gave an overall picture of the students' academic work and performance (a selection from low, middle and high bands of marks, including fails and 2<sup>nd</sup> attempts) for the optional modules and the Dissertation Literature Review assignment.

11. **Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Board of Examiners?**

Yes, all structures were in place for the satisfactory operation of the Examination Board.

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

Yes. This information was available in the Course Guide for the students to access.

### **For Examiners involved in Mentoring Arrangements**

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

Not applicable

### **Other Comments**

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

#### **Summary:**

1. The questions the lecturers set were excellent and reflected the indicative contents and the learning outcomes in the Module Guides.
2. The internal markers were fair and consistent with their comments which were detail and comprehensive.

3. The students who did not achieve the pass mark or adequate mark in the main did not address the requirements of the questions set. This sometimes arose in the reflection part of the assignment.
4. Generally the students produced a well ordered and convincing analysis. The structure of the assignments produced by the students was generally coherent and logical. The issues they raised in their work were well reasoned and grounded with explanation.
5. Students have drawn on their own management experience in writing their dissertations to demonstrate the application of theory to the practice of hospital management.

#### Assessment marks

1. Marks on the boundary: ensuring that module marks normally end in 0-8 and that any exceptions to this are clearly justified: If any boundary marks (ending in 9) are included please explain why. The safety of such boundary is questionable. It could make a difference between a student failing to achieve a pass or achieving a pass mark with merit. This was evidenced during my last visit where a student achieved 59.9 and could have achieved a merit. I suggest such a mark should be rounded up to enable the student to achieve a higher mark.
2. Dissertation – Students have the tendency to end each chapter with a sub-section: “conclusion” which I found rather confusing. I suggest that a ‘summary’ paragraph at the end of each chapter will be more appropriate. A concluding chapter at the end of the dissertation brings together the discussion so far in the dissertation.
3. Students should be able to differentiate between conceptual framework and tools for analysis. These concepts were used interchangeably by some students.
4. On some occasions the feedback given to students on their assignments do not match the marks awarded to them. Feedback must be commensurate with mark awarded to the student.

#### **Feedback from students (4).**

Feedback from the students was largely positive. Feedback indicated that students felt that the course is well planned and has met with their expectations, especially the three week hospital attachment.

There are however, some issues which the students raised which need to be addressed as part of the continuing Programme improvement process.

They expressed the following concerns:

1. The Foundation Module was too generic and public health focused.
2. No dedicated classroom for the course. Moving classrooms from building to building was very disruptive and time consuming.
3. Three weeks for hospital placement was not enough, especially with intervening holidays. Moving this to “Session Two” they pointed out, will solve the problem and give them sufficient time to write their dissertation.

Finally, students were very praiseworthy of the Course Team, especially the Programme Director.

All staff on the course were very ‘helpful’, ‘approachable’ and ‘welcoming’.

The University environment was experienced as very conducive to learning.

The students said that they learned very many skills, especially: time management, presentation and computer skills.

<<<<>>>>

External Examiner)  
18<sup>th</sup> September 2011

School of Medicine  
Learning and Teaching Office

University of Leeds  
Worsley Building  
Clarendon Way  
Leeds LS2 9NL

T +44 (0) 113 343 7234  
F +44 (0) 113 343 2597



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

12<sup>th</sup> January 2012

Dear I

**Hospital Management: External Examiner Report 2010/2011**

I am writing to thank you for your 2010/2011 External Examiner Report for the Hospital Management programme.

I have attached the response to your report from the out-going Programme Manager, Dr Tom Dessoify. I was pleased to see you highlighting the quality of the assessment questions and case studies. The School of Medicine puts a great deal of effort into assuring assessments are fair and challenging, and feedback is extensive and helpful.

I hope that the programme's response to the issues that you raised, particularly on marks at the boundary and the dissertations, are satisfactory. The teaching space is an issue that the School takes seriously. More teaching space has become available for the 2011-12 session, and I hope that the students will find the space more appropriate.

Many thanks once again for your hard work.

Yours sincerely



Dr Graham Law  
Director of Postgraduate Studies

Enc. Response from Programme Manager

cc: Dr Tom Dessoify, Programme Manager  
Dr G Barker-Read, AQST

