

## 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:	Leeds Institute Health Sciences
Subject(s):	
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Postgraduate Certificate Stroke Care
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	PGCertificate

**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?*

**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 was restructured and now runs from January to December following student feedback. These included: the time period for discussions board posts were considered too short and no breaks between modules which had a detrimental effect on learning and preparation for assessments. The content of the modules are updated and student feedback integrated. The programme is supported by colleagues in the Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS foundation Trust. The team have included more signposting to critical analysis resources.

Standards are appropriate for the award. The programme is now endorsed by the UK Stroke Forum for Education and training. The team has worked extremely hard to prepare for the submission and the team utilised a programme development fund by the former Stroke Clinical Network.

### 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 ILOs are comparable to similar programmes at other institutions

### 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.*

As in my previous report, the design and structure of the assessments methods are appropriate for the programme. Guidelines for assignments are continually updated and formats adjusted in response to student and external examiner's feedback. The learning resources are excellent as is the range of expertise available to teach on the programme. The assessment methods are varied, which allows students to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding. Adobe Connect was introduced this year as a means to provide online assessment tutorials in real time. The students commented positively on this though some technical challenges remain for the team to address.

### 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 quality of the student performance is generally good, with some excellent results. Most students continue to struggle with the higher demands of critical appraisal and development of arguments in their written assignments, but this is a problem on comparable courses and not a reflection on the teaching.

### 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.*

Enhancements to the programme are continually made in response to student feedback, external examiner's comments and NHS changes.

### 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.*

I would find it difficult to provide specific examples which demonstrated the impact of research on the curriculum and teaching and learning. The assignments demonstrate integration of recent research evidence, policy and practice guidelines.

### 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.*

All documents are provided in a timely manner with sufficient details regarding results, assignments and feedback. The course director remains in excellent communication regarding any issues that may arise. I was able to act effectively as external examiner.

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.*

Module handbooks are not automatically provided, but I presume that no major changes have been made that needed my attention. The programme remains unchanged.

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?

N/A

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?

Sufficient assessed work was made available to have full confidence on the evaluation of the standard of the student work. Scripts were clearly marked and annotated. Feedback provided to the students was consistent, in excellent depth and detail, both constructive and supportive.

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?

Arrangements are wholly satisfactory. I am satisfied with the recommendations of the board.

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

Considerations were made regarding extenuating circumstances. Discussions were taken place within the university in line with the quality manual.

## Other comments

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

The student feedback is consistently positive regarding the programme. The numbers on the programme however are small, which is a concern for the team. Steps have been taken to increase the marketing of the programme which includes the SSEF accreditation.

School of Medicine  
Faculty of Medicine and Health  
Worsley Building  
Clarendon Way  
Leeds  
LS2 9NL  
T: 0113  
F: 0113



**UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS**

27 November 2015

Dear

**External Examiner's report for Stroke Care 2014-15**

Thank you for assembling your report for the programme in Stroke Care. I note that there were no urgent matters for attention. You comment that the academic standards and content of student work are appropriate for the level of award. Despite the Stroke Care team securing the recognition by the UK Stroke Forum for Education and Training, the programme has been suspended because of low numbers of applications.

**Good practice**

You report that the learning resources are excellent. You note 'Guidelines for assignments are continually updated and formats adjusted in response to student and external examiner's feedback.' This demonstrates the careful approach of the Programme Leader in listening to student comments and taking action. You comment on the detailed feedback provided to students and annotations on assessed work. I was pleased to learn of this good practice.

**Programme Leader's response**

I have enclosed with this letter a response assembled by Programme Leader.  
comments on the challenges of developing critical analytical skills.

Thank you so much for your report as External Examiner. Your contributions to the programme in Stroke Care are much valued.

Yours sincerely

Enc: 23 November 2015

**Director of Postgraduate Studies**



23rd November 2015

Dear

Re: External Examiner's report- Post Graduate Certificate in Stroke Care

We are grateful to [redacted] for continued support for the programme in [redacted] role as External Examiner. We were pleased to receive the annual report for the session 2014-15. We note the positive overall comments about the programme and also the comments regarding the timely and appropriate provision of programme materials to facilitate the external moderation process. As a programme team we have noted previously the comments regarding the challenges in developing critical thinking skills in the students who are completing the programme. We have worked this year to provide additional direction and support to our students in this area but have not seen a marked improvement in the level of critical thinking evident in assessed work. Going forward we will continue look for ways to further develop these skills within the programme. As before we note comment regarding evidence of specific examples which demonstrate the impact of research on the curriculum and teaching and learning. The programme team continue to introduce students to current research in the ever developing field of stroke care. We also ensure students are introduced to the stroke focused research being conducted by members of the programme team and also those who contribute to the teaching in the modules which make up the programme. We will continue to monitor and going forward, where possible, we will develop this aspect of the programme.

As in previous years we have found [redacted] feedback on the programme and on the student work submitted to be very helpful. As you are aware, due to the continuing small numbers of students seeking to undertake this programme a decision has been taken to suspend the programme.

[redacted] understands why this decision has been taken and is willing to consult with the programme team as we undertake a review of the programme and examine the options for the future of the programme.

Yours sincerely

Programme Leader (on behalf of the programme team).