

## 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:	School of Medicine
Subject(s):	Clinical Embryology and Assisted Reproduction Technology (full time taught)
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MSc
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MSc

**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?*

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.*
- Very appropriate
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
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 design and structure of the assessment methods was well thought out and the assessment process robust.
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.*
- The students I saw present their work had carried out a lengthy research project in a lab. They generally presented the findings in a clear fashion and were able to answer questions on the project. I felt some of the weaker students were less able to answer questions of a more general manner, despite the topics under discussion (eg the mechanism of oocyte activation) being part of the taught course.
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.*
- Very good enhancements in online 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.*
- The students I saw present their work had carried out a lengthy research project in a lab and had gained good insights not only into the practice of a number of techniques, but also a good understanding of the scientific method.
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

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?

Yes

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

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**

This is my first year as External Examiner. Generally I am pleased with the course structure and the procedures in place for assessing the student performance. It would be worth considering how to improve the ability of the students to answer general questions about the course in their dissertation presentations, as there was some weakness displayed here.

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

University of Leeds  
Worsley Building  
Clarendon Way  
Leeds LS2 9NL  
T: 0113  
F: 0113



**UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS**

19 December 2015

Dear

**External Examiner's report for Clinical Embryology and Assisted Reproduction Technology 2014-15**

As the School of Medicine's Director of Postgraduate Studies, I receive all the External Examiners' reports for the twenty five programmes offered in 2014-15. First, let me thank you for assembling the 2014-15 report for the distance learning programmes in Clinical Embryology and Assisted Reproduction Technology (CEART). The programme was offered for the first time in 2014-15 and this is your first report.

**Good practice**

I note that your report states that there are no matters requiring urgent attention. You state 'The design and structure of the assessment methods was well thought out and the assessment process robust.' The report notes the influence of research on the programme and the students' understanding of applied and theoretical research techniques.

**Students' abilities to answer questions**

I enclose a response assembled by the Programme Leader, \_\_\_\_\_ who notes your comments on the research conference. The programme team will give clearer guidance in the future.

*continues .*

Director of Postgraduate Studies



This new programme has launched successfully. Recruitment is good and is now limited by laboratory space available. Your contributions to both CEART and the distance learning Clinical Embryology programmes are much valued.

Yours sincerely

Enc: 18 December 2015

LIGHT Laboratories  
Clarendon Way  
University of Leeds  
Leeds, LS2 9JT

T +44 (0) 113  
F +44 (0) 113  
E



**UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS**

**18<sup>th</sup> December 2015**

**Dear**

***Re: External Examiners Report From  
MSc in Clinical Embryology and Assisted Reproduction Technology***

The programme management team would like to thank \_\_\_\_\_ for \_\_\_\_\_ support for this new MSc. \_\_\_\_\_ feedback was very encouraging.

\_\_\_\_\_ attended the student research project presentations and highlighted one area for improvement. Student project presentations were run as a “research conference” such that presentations were attended by all members of the student body, academic staff associated with the MSc and research project tutors. Each student’s research project presentation was followed by an open question and answer session that included questions on their specific project, questions relevant to the research module and more general questions relevant to the field of clinical embryology and assisted reproduction. \_\_\_\_\_ commented that some students coped better than others in the latter two aspects. The research presentation and the student’s ability to respond to questions forms part of the summative assessment of their research module. The difference between students in their ability to respond to the more challenging questions provided an accurate insight into the student’s academic performance during the course of their MSc as a whole and, as such, reflected their overall degree classification. While a student’s ability to respond to questions will always be a barometer of the individual’s ability and understanding, we recognise that some students in the cohort were not as well prepared for general questions as they might have been. We therefore will provide students with clearer instructions on how to prepare for their research presentations and we will also provide guidance on the examiners expectations of the question and answer session.

Yours sincerely,

Programme Manager MSc in Clinical Embryology and Assisted Reproduction Technology.  
Head of Division Of Reproduction & Early Development