

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 and Health/ School of Medicine
Subject(s):	<i>GPPH</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	PG Certificate Education in Primary Care
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.

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

- 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 intended learning outcomes are appropriate for the module and are at the challenging end of the spectrum for this level of study
- 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 programme is comparable with other similar programmes at other institutions with which I am familiar.

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 assessment is based on students' performance in the production of a traditional essay in each of the four modules. The rubric gives some useful word pictures of what to expect of an assignment at different levels. I am impressed by the detail and quality of feedback given to candidates on their assignments and the constructive suggestions given for improvement. Assignments are double marked and I have been able to review a range of assessed pieces from fails to excellents. I would encourage use of the full marking scale as some exceptional work I viewed did not benefit from an award at the very highest end of the spectrum.
- By and large students are able to demonstrate high standards in the production of the assignments used to assess students learning which would indicate high standards in the quality of teaching, learning and assessment. Students who do not meet the standards for written work at this level are accurately and consistently identified against clear criteria and given clear written guidance on how to improve their work

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. By and large the students have demonstrated high academic standards.
- Strengths include the depth and breadth of literature used to support their work how they are able to evidence their depth of understanding of the literature. Weaknesses include some failure of some students to follow basic guidelines in the production of the written work and issues with referencing appropriately.
- As with other courses, and cohorts, it can take some time for some students to become comfortable with critique with a tendency to describe at times.

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 now seeing the more practically orientated work coming through in the student pieces in relation to induction of learners.

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.

Continued high quality, detailed and specific feedback, which is given to students on their written work. This is true at all levels from fail to excellent.

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 curriculum is informed by best practice in curriculum design and 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

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 and Yes. Scripts were annotated with high quality specific feedback throughout.

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

Yes

Yes

I was able to attend by video/telephone conference

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

Not involved in this aspect in this year

Other comments

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

This is my third year with the primary care education team. I continue to be impressed by the high quality academic and administrative working, which I believe to be reflected in the quality of the experience for students. Certainly in the assessments I have reviewed students continue to benefit from very high quality feedback on their work, which will help them to improve their academic and teaching performance. The move to more practically orientated assignments is welcome.

**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

12 November 2015

Dear

External Examiner's report for Education in Primary Care 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 Postgraduate Certificate in Education in Primary Care.

Good practice

I note that your report states that there are no matters requiring urgent attention. You indicate that the strengths of the student cohort include the depth and breadth of literature used to support their work and how they are able to evidence their depth of understanding of the literature.

I have just been reading the comments made by students in an anonymous survey. They mention the enthusiastic and detailed delivery by the Education in Primary Care tutors on the programme.

Standards

You state in the standards section that the learning outcomes and programme content are appropriate for postgraduate study in Education in Primary Care. You note that the curriculum is informed by best practice in curriculum design and delivery.

Thank you so much for your report as External Examiner for the Education in Primary Care programme.

Yours sincerely

Enc: 3 November 2015

Director of Postgraduate Studies





Quality Assurance Team

Received 21/04/2016

Tuesday 3rd November

Dear

is now in third year acting as the external examiner for PG Certificate Education in Primary Care. I would like to thank for producing the external examiners report. raised no matter for urgent attention. continues to support us with reviewing assignment submissions and notes was able to review a range of awarded marks. is a supportive and challenging addition to our course management meetings where always keeps a clear student focus, this is reflected in the move to more practically orientated assignments.

We are pleased that reports students scripts are annotated with high quality and specific feedback throughout. also highlights that students who do not meet the standard for written work are accurately and consistently identified and are given clear guidance on how to improve their work in order to pass. does encourage use of the range of marks available observing that some excellent assignments were not marked at the end of the spectrum, this was discussed at our last course management meeting where it became clear that was not aware of the criteria that awarding a mark of 80 would imply a publishable standard on our marking grid.

highlights no specific areas for development for the next academic year.

We would like to thank for attending all of our meetings, and we look forward to hosting in early 2016 to observe our module delivery in person.

Best wishes,

Programme Leader

Postgraduate Programmes in Education in Primary Care