

## The University of Leeds

## EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2014– 2015

**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*

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?*

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. For most modules there was a tendency to avoid awarding 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**

**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 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.

**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.*

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

## 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.*

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.*

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?

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?

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

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?

16. 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

<<>>

08 April 2016

Dear <<>>,

Thank you for your recent Examiner's Report for the PG Cert Leadership in Health.

We are very pleased with your comments on our programme, especially those around the overall high quality of teaching being evident through the standard of assessments. We also appreciate your recognition of the relationship between current research and curriculum content, especially given the turbulence in the NHS context.

We are happy to hear that you feel that our assessment methods are generally appropriate. **We have noted your comment concerning the limited number of assignments awarded 80 marks and above, especially given the overall high standard of performance. We will advise markers to use the full range of marks in line with our guidance, although this does remain a challenge to implement as you point out.**

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

Yours sincerely,

<<>>

**Dean  
Leeds University Business School**

*Tel: +44(0) 113 <<>>  
Fax: +44(0) 113 <<>>  
Email: <<>>*