

**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:	LUBS
Subject(s):	
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Leading in a Clinical Context - Medicine and Management, Co-producing Health, Thinking and Acting for Effective Practice, Commissioning Whole Systems
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	PG Cert

**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](mailto: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*

.
---

**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?*

N/A
-----

**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 Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) were appropriate, as were standards for the award.

**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 Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) were comparable with similar programmes and national benchmarks.

**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 methods were appropriate. Students are NHS staff and assessment involves a combination of students' own experience and course content. In addition to making assessment very relevant to students' own real world context, this reduces opportunities for plagiarism. Performance was generally impressive which suggests that teaching and learning was of good quality.

**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.*

Students were given adequate opportunity to demonstrate achievement of the Aims and ILOs. In a small number of cases, students focused on their experiences without paying adequate attention to the course content. However, the fact that most students did not do this suggests that the guidance provided about what was required was adequate. For the Co-producing Health module the full range of marks was used. The top candidate was awarded 90% and deservedly so. Even then, feedback highlighted areas for improvement which is a reflection of how seriously feedback is taken across the programme generally. However, for most modules there was a tendency to avoid awarding such high marks. This resonates with my experience at my institution and elsewhere so it is not unusual and reminding markers about using the full range of marks has not produced much change at my University.

**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.*

N/A

**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 relationship between research and curriculum content is impressive. In the context of an NHS which is subject to often turbulent change and reorganisation it is important that relevant research is incorporated into the curriculum. The content draws on relevant and up to date research to enrich student learning.

**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.*

This was sufficient. I have acted as External Examiner at 2 other Universities previously. In one case a training day was held for externals which I attended. But I did not learn anything in addition to the written guidance provided.

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. The nature and level of questions were appropriate. To a large extent assessment replicated the previous year. Since the assignments mostly involved drawing on students' own experience this minimised the potential for students to plagiarise. The assignments all required students to draw on content from across the module, which reduced the potential for instrumental learning cherry picking from a narrow section.

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. The scripts were clearly annotated. The typewritten feedback was impressive. A combination of a marking template which facilitated consistency and detailed feedback gave students ample information to understand their mark, what had been done well and areas for improvement.

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

N?A

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 I attended the Board. This year rather than reading out marks for each student, a truncated process was used. I thought that this worked well. I was satisfied with the recommendations.

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

At another University where I acted as an external, examiners are encouraged to seek student feedback and report on this as a specific section of their report. I did this by email with a small number of students (since not all responded). Students valued the programme and found it to be of high quality. They praised the teaching quality and the venue and catering also. However, it was suggested that given the change in programme recruitment to include nurses, the module 'Medicine and Management' should not be so heavily focused on doctors, as opposed to other clinicians. One student suggested that assessment burden was loaded heavily towards the second half of the programme. From my knowledge of the literature and research in this area, there is a heavy focus on doctors so it may be that this perceived bias reflects the state of knowledge. However, if this is the case, then it might be useful to explain this to students to avoid unmet expectations on this matter.

<<>>

18 May 2015

Dear <<>>,

Thank you for your recent Examiner's Report for the PG Cert Leading in a Clinical Context (2013/2014).

We are delighted overall with your feedback on our programme. The design team have worked hard to continually improve and evolve the programme through feedback from each cohort, their sponsors and indeed from yourself. It's reassuring indeed to hear that such design and content improvements are appropriate and well received.

We are particularly happy that you consider our assessment practise appropriate and thank you for recognising the high performance of our fellows within their assessed work and attributing such performance to high quality teaching and learning. We do also strive, as you state, to ensure the programme is directly relevant to real world matters within a clinical context and that each fellow's individual project directly addresses real issues within their environments. We do also recognise the heavy weighting of assessed work toward the end of the academic year. Although this is based primarily on the context within the learner's journey, we will strive to communicate these workloads better at the outset, helping students to plan more effectively.

We appreciate your recognition of the appropriate relationship between research and the curriculum. It's important to us that we sensibly use up to date research within this field to enrich the course content and learning experience. Similarly, consistent and appropriate feedback is of great importance to us and we appreciate your acknowledgment of our quality here. It is imperative to us that each fellow feels that they are able to reflect appropriately on their assessed work throughout the programme, which we believe is driven by the appropriate level of feedback and support.

Your comments on the bias toward reference to doctors as opposed to other clinical roles have been duly noted. Considering the increased diversity now within the cohort, we have amended the title of the 'Management & Medicine' module to 'Clinical Leadership & Management' and made efforts, as far as practical given the constraints of the research evidence, to broaden the approach out from a medical focus and across other clinical professions.

We are very grateful for your supportive comments and your continued guidance for our programmes.

Yours sincerely,

<<>>

*Dean*

*Leeds University Business School*

<<>>