

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:	Medicine and Health/ School of Medicine
Subject(s):	<i>GPPH</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	PG Certificate Education in Primary Care
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	PG Cert

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 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?

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

N/A

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 intended learning outcomes are appropriate for the module and are at the challenging end of the spectrum for this level of study

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 programme is comparable with other similar programmes at other institutions with which I am familiar.

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 is based on students' performance in the production of a traditional essay in each of the four modules. Two modules include the assessment of a reflective commentary on a videoed consultation or teaching session on the consultation as part of the assessment. The rubric gives some useful word pictures of what to expect of an assignment at different levels. I am impressed by the detail and quality of feedback given to candidates on their assignments. By and large students are able to demonstrate high standards in the production of the assignments used to assess students learning which would indicate high standards in the quality of teaching, learning and assessment.

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.

By and large the students have demonstrated high academic standards.

Strengths include the depth and breadth of literature used to support their work how they are able to evidence their depth of understanding of the literature. Weaknesses include some failure of some students to follow basic guidelines in the production of the written work. A couple of cases of plagiarism were highlighted in spite of robust guidance given to the students in this area.

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

I have emphasised in my commentaries to the staff in the programme that some rebalancing of content may be needed to allow a more practical and less theoretical approach to the subject matter to ensure that participants are appropriately prepared for learners in their own setting.

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.

The detailed and specific feedback given to students throughout their assignments by the markers is to be commended and highlighted.

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 curriculum is informed by best practice in curriculum design and delivery.

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

N/A

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?

Yes

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 and yes. Scripts were annotated with high quality specific feedback throughout.

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

Yes, although please see my comments above regarding the balance of application to practice and theoretical understanding. Methods and standards of assessment were appropriate.

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?

Yes

Yes

Yes

Some difficulties in gaining a clear view of all the different modules through Blackboard, part of this are the failings of the Blackboard system. However some improvements could be made in standardising the content in each module e.g. module outcomes are presented in the same format for each module, mitigating circumstances form is published in each module assessment area or in an overarching programme level folder.

15. 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

This is my first year with the primary care education team. I have been impressed by the high quality academic and administrative working, which I believe to be reflected in the quality of the experience for students. Certainly in the assessments I have reviewed students benefit from very high quality feedback on their work, which will help them to improve their performance.

**Leeds Institute of Medical Education
School of Medicine
Faculty of Medicine and Health**

University of Leeds
Worsley Building
Clarendon Way
Leeds LS2 9NL

<>



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

<>

21 November 2013

Dear <>

External Examiner's report for Education in Primary Care 2012-13

As the School of Medicine's Director of Postgraduate Studies, I receive all the External Examiners' reports for the eighteen programmes offered in 2012-13. First, let me thank you for assembling the 2012-13 report for the Postgraduate Certificate in Education in Primary Care. This is your first report.

Good practice

I note that your report states that there are no matters requiring urgent attention. You highlight that the strengths of the programme include the depth and breadth of literature used to support the students' work and how they are able to evidence their depth of understanding of the published literature.

Concerns

The programme team has commented on your statement about plagiarism in the Programme Leaders response (enclosed). You have noted an imbalance between theory and practice. I can confirm that the Primary Care team has made a change to the assessment in the relevant module as an item in the Action Plan for 2013-14. This is part of the School's Quality and Enhancement Review and its implementation will be monitored by the School.

Standards

You state in the standards section that the learning outcomes and programme content are appropriate for postgraduate study in Education in Primary Care.

continues

Director of Postgraduate Studies

<>



Thank you so much for your first report as External Examiner for the Education in Primary Care programme.

Yours sincerely

<>

Enc: <> 19 November 2013