

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:	Division of Women and Children's Health
Subject(s):	Child Health
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MSc Child Health
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MSc / PGDip

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?

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.*

Intended Learning Outcomes are appropriate for the level of the award and in addition are relevant to the professional education of the trainees participating in the course

- 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.*

There are no established national benchmarks, but in comparison with other MSc programmes I have examined for, the Intended Learning Outcomes are equivalent and in some cases exceed those elsewhere

- 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.*

This is thorough and reliable. I am impressed with the rigour of the approach to assessment and am confident in the resulting marks being a true and carefully considered reflection of the students work and performance

- 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.*

Overall a representative cohort of students. Some are excellent, most are good, a few are deficient. This is as I would expect. There is a detailed selection process for these trainees outwith the university, the overall standard of students is therefore likely to be, and would be expected to be, high.

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

This is well covered. All examiners are clinicians and assessments for all components of the course take clinical aspects into consideration. Some of the course, eg some of the modules and the logbook/portfolio are directly clinical, while other parts, eg the research elements, are more academic. The attainment of MSc (or PGDip) is an achievement that is directly relevant to the trainees future clinical practice.

- 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.

A steady improvement in statistical and research support for the research module. Expansion of the course to include South Yorkshire has been successful and well received.

- 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.

There is a strong influence of research. There is a mandatory research project in order to be awarded the MSc, some of the modules are directly related to research and academic synthesis of research findings, while the clinical modules are also strongly influenced by research evidence and the need to follow evidence based decisions

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

Not applicable

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

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 is fine. I am well supported

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 – I am well supported with this.

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?

I have been shown samples of these and I am pleased with the standard and content

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 where required

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

Yes – there is a well developed system for support and assessment of students dissertations including a proposal viva which acts both as support to students development of research ideas and part of the summative assessment.

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?

These are fine. The Leeds team make arrangements to fit examiners meetings in to my schedule.

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

Yes – these are always carefully discussed among the examiners.

Other comments

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

The administrative arrangements and the work of <> and <> deserve particular recognition – they make the work of an external examiner a pleasure. They are always approachable and accommodating. The smooth running of the programme is the result of their input.

**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

<>

<>

26th February 2015

Dear <>

External Examiner's report for Child Health 2013-14

As the School of Medicine's Director of Postgraduate Studies, I receive all the External Examiners' reports for the eighteen programmes offered in 2013-14. First, let me thank you for assembling the 2013-14 report for the programmes in Child Health.

Good practice

I note that your report states that there are no matters requiring urgent attention. You comment that the programme is well regarded nationally and that research and/or clinical practice are at the centre of the programme. You report that the expansion of the programme to include paediatricians from South Yorkshire has gone well.

Statistical input

In previous years there has been concern on the amount of statistical advice made available to the students. You note that this is much improved.

Standards

You state in the standards section that the learning outcomes and programme content are appropriate for postgraduate study in Child Health. You note that the education supports the professional education of the trainees participating in the course

Director of Postgraduate Studies

<>



Administration

You comment that the administrative support was excellent. It is good to know that your visits to Leeds are arranged efficiently. Thank you for crediting <> and <> for the excellent administration.

Thank you so much for your report as External Examiner for the Child Health programmes.

Yours sincerely

<>

<>

Enc: <> 19 December 2014

<>

19 December 2014

Dear <>

Re: External Examiner's Report 201314 (Dr Richard Reading)

I thank <> for <> External Examiner Report concerning the Postgraduate Programmes in Child Health. The comments regarding the rigour of our assessment process and the effectiveness of our Course Administrators are particularly encouraging.

There are no issues raised in this report that require action by the School or Programme.

With best wishes

Yours sincerely

<>

<>
Programme Manager, Postgraduate Programmes in Child Health

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:	Medicine
Subject(s):	<i>Paediatrics and Child Health</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Research project proposal and dissertation
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MSc in Child Health

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?

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.*

In comparison to other MSc courses that I have examined on (<>, <>) I think that the structure and content of the course is appropriate; in particular the level of supervision and guidance given is either very good or excellent in most instances

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.*

N/A

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.*

Appropriate methods and processes are in place for both the marking of modules and the classification of awards. The research proposals are informed by discussions with the course tutors, their own supervisors and appropriate high-level statistical advice

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 academic standards demonstrated by the students were either similar to or better than the standards I have seen demonstrated elsewhere. The strengths of the students are in their determination to undertake the work to a high standard; as in other places, this can be impeded by clinical work pressures and family commitments; a high degree of personal organisation is needed to achieve more than a "pass" grading.

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 am not asked to examine this component of the course

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 components of the course that I examine have not undergone revision or amendment

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 research project/dissertation component has not changed in terms of structure/delivery

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 – material appropriate to course and modules examined

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; all material matched well within my areas of responsibility

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?

All relevant papers were provided

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?

Each of the proposals and final dissertations were available

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

Range of dissertation subjects reflecting the diversity of paediatrics; assessment process very clear and unambiguous, candidates well informed about process, timelines and expectations

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; all meetings attended, recommendations all agreed and appropriate

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

Yes, where appropriate

Other comments

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

**School of Medicine
Faculty of Medicine and Health**

University of Leeds
Worsley Building
Clarendon Way
Leeds LS2 9NL



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

<>

<>

26th February 2015

Dear <>

External Examiner's report for Child Health 2013-14

As the School of Medicine's Director of Postgraduate Studies, I receive all the External Examiners' reports for the eighteen programmes offered in 2013-14. First, let me thank you for assembling the 2013-14 report for the programmes in Child Health.

Good practice

I note that your report states that there are no matters requiring urgent attention. You comment that the structure and content of the programme is appropriate and that guidance and supervision is excellent.

Material provided

Your report indicates that you received samples of student work and that the administrative aspects were good. You comment that the students presented a variety of dissertations of a high standard. The assessment process was clear to you and the candidates.

Thank you so much for your report as External Examiner for the Child Health programmes.

Yours sincerely

<>

<>

Enc: <>19 December 2014

Director of Postgraduate Studies

<>



<>

19 December 2014

Dear <>

Re: External Examiner's Report 201314 (Prof Nick Bishop)

I thank <> for <> External Examiner's Report concerning the Postgraduate Programmes in Child Health. We were particularly encouraged by <> positive comments regarding the support and help with professional development we give to our students.

There are no issues raised by <> that the School or the Programme need to address.

With best wishes

Yours sincerely

<>

<>
Programme Manager, Postgraduate Programmes in Child Health