

## 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:	Medicine
Subject(s):	
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Phase 5 (Final MB)
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MB BCh

##### 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

No

##### 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?

Second year of appointment.

##### 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.

I believe that the stated learning outcomes were commensurate and appropriate with the level of award. This is based on my own experience of my home institution (<<>) and the recommendations outline in the GMCs document (Tomorrows Doctors 2009)

**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.*

I believe that the stated learning outcomes met the expectations of the national subject benchmark as outlined by the GMC in the document Tomorrows Doctors (2009)

**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 used in this diet of examinations were appropriate to the stated learning outcomes of the course and the allocation of marks and classification of awards. The assessment instruments made judgements on not only the cognitive but also the behavioural aspects of candidates clinical competence.

**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.*

It is my opinion that students were given an adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievements of the courses' aims and ILOs. The examinations were effectively and systematically blueprinted to the stated learning outcomes of the course. I believe that the standard of students in this cohort were comparable to the cohort of 13-14 and also final year medical students in my home institution (<<>>).

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

With respect to the 'clinical practice' components, the OSCE element of this assessment was an example of best assessment practice. It is my opinion that their OSCE was designed and delivered to be fair, reliable and valid. The team have to be complemented on their efforts right from those that lead the assessment to those that delivered the OSCEs on the day.

**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.*

- 1) The assessment team co-constructed some of the OSCEs station with patient (voice) groups. This is an excellent idea that worked very well on the day and raises the patient's voice in the curriculum.
- 2) Internal examiners were asked to record narrative about each candidates performance in the OSCE. Student feedback is often challenging to provide candidates in OSCEs – though this method goes some way in providing some personalised feedback. I would encourage the group to develop and finesse this initiative in the future.

**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 psychometric analysis of the results of the assessment were very much influenced by research. In fact several members of the assessment team have contribute to the evidence base around this topic.

**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.*

I believe that the information provided was sufficient and made available to me in a timely manner.

- 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 received appropriate documentation in relation to the course and assessment content / process

- 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 – I was provided with the necessary paper work. I believe that the nature and level of the questions were appropriate. Again this was based on my experience of the last years diet of examinations, standards in my home institution (QUB) and the recommendations set out by the GMC in their document Tomorrows Doctors (2009)

- 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?**

With regards to the OSCE I was present on all of the assessment days and was able to witness first-hand the 'questions (stations) being presented to candidates and their performance.

- 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. The administrative arrangements were more than satisfactory and efficient. I was able to attend and contribute to the Board of Examiners meeting.

- 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**

Based on my observations I believe that the Final MB assessment at the University of Leeds (2014-15) was fair, conducted in a professional manner and comparative to other medical schools that I have experience of. The detailed post hoc psychometrics analysis of results confirmed that it was also a reliable assessment. I was very impressed with the organisation of the examinations and received good and timely communications from the assessment team. I would like to particularly thank the assessment team in facilitating my visits and responding to me queries in a timely manner. There were numerous examples of good practice that are detailed later in this report.

## 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:	Medicine
Subject(s):	<i>Finals</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MChB
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MChB

##### 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?*

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*

##### 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 programme aims and learning outcomes were entirely appropriate for the level of award of MChB

#### 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.*

Yes the standard required to pass is consistent with or above that in other medical final exams I have experienced as internal lead for assessment (<<>>), Dean of BSMS and external examiner roles.

**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 sequential OSCE assessment is at the forefront of assessment design and entirely appropriate for this level of 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 the assessment provides ample opportunity to demonstrate relevant skills and application of underpinning knowledge in realistic simulated situations

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

See above

**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 assessment programme and use of sequential testing are clear examples of best practice nationally and internationally

**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.*

Not able to assess from the content perspective but the assessment programme and design is a clear example of a research based assessment programme

**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 – entirely sufficient

**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

**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

**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 overall – unfortunately I could not attend the Board but had a full discussion with Dr Fuller and made my contribution ahead of the meeting.

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

No comment possible but no concern

#### Other comments

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

Overall a very good and well run exam with many commendable features from a high quality team. The infrastructure support was exceptional given the size and complexity of the exam and the examiner 'buy in' at all levels was strong.