

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**  
**ACADEMIC YEAR: 2015– 2016**

**Part A: General Information****Subject area and awards being examined**

Faculty / School of:	School of Medicine / Leeds Institute of Health Sciences
Subject(s):	<i>Health Economics</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	<b>MSc Health Economics</b> HECN5010M Principles of Health Economics HECN5020M Economic Evaluation for Health Technology Assessment HECN5030M Applied Health Econometrics HECN5040M Health Economics Dissertation
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*

**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. This is a new programme which started in September 2015.

**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 Aims and ILOs for the modules are appropriate and commensurate with the level of 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 ILOs are comparable to similar programmes at other universities.
  
- 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 methods are appropriate and suitable for judging whether the ILOs have been achieved. Based on student performance the quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods is consistently high.
  
- 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 were given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement and performed similarly to students on comparable courses at other institutions.
  
- 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.*

N/A
  
- 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 material taught to students is appropriate and informed by current research in health economics. Students have the opportunity to undertake an independent supervised piece of research in the Health Economics Dissertation module.
  
- 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.*

The guidance provided was 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?

I was provided with draft examination papers and assessments and I found the nature and level of the questions appropriate. Where minor suggestions for changes were made these were dealt with promptly and efficiently.

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 examined work was made available to enable me to have confidence in my evaluation of the standard of student work. The scripts were very clearly marked and detailed feedback was given to explain and justify the marks.

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

The choice of subjects for dissertations was appropriate, and so was the method and standard of assessment.

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?

The administrative arrangements were satisfactory for the whole process. I was not able to attend the Board of Examiners meeting as planned due to a personal emergency.

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

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



<<>>

19 November 2016

Dear <<>>

**External Examiner's report for Health Economics 2015-16**

As the School of Medicine's Director of Postgraduate Studies, I receive all the External Examiners' reports for the twenty five subjects offered at Master's level. First, let me thank you for assembling the 2015-16 report for the programme in Health Economics. This is your first report on this new programme.

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 and comparable to similar programmes delivered at different institutions.

**Programme Leader's response**

I have enclosed with this letter a response assembled <<>>, Deputy Programme Leader.

**Good practice**

You state, 'The material taught to students is appropriate and informed by current research in health economics'. Thank you for this observation of good practice. I note that you were consulted on the assessments and you found the administrative arrangements were satisfactory.

Thank you so much for your report as External Examiner. Your contributions to the Health Economics programme are much valued.

Yours sincerely

<<>>

<<>>

Enc: <<>> 17 November 2016

Director of Postgraduate Studies  
<<>>



17<sup>th</sup> November 2016

<<>>

Dear <<>>

With this letter I would like to thank you for your work as external examiner on the first year running of our MSc Programme in Health Economics.

We received the External Examiner Report and I would like to say that your feedback on the methods and conduct of assessment are highly valuable to the whole teaching team. Finally, we are happy that you were satisfied with the whole process.

Yours sincerely

<<>>

Programme Deputy Director