

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17      QAT Received 26/10/2017

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

*Subject(s):*

*Programme(s) / Module(s):*

*Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):*

School of Philosophy, Religion & History of Science

**History and Philosophy of Science**

MA in History of Science, Technology and Medicine  
MA in History and Philosophy of Science

HPSC5150M Historical Skills and Practices

HPSC5201M Current Approaches in the History of Science, Technology & Medicine

HPSC5320M Science and Religion Historically Considered

HPSC5400M Advanced Topics in History and Philosophy of Biology

HPSC5601M History & Theory of Modern Science Communication

HPSC5620M Philosophy of Science: Classic Debates & Current Trends

HPSC5800M The Origin of Modern Medicine (Birth of the Clinic)

MA

**Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards**

**Points of innovation and/or good practice**

There are a number of areas of good practice.

- Feedback on written work is of a high standard
- The process for arriving at an agreed mark is very clear and gives the External a clear understanding of the process.
- The combination of courses reflects student's intellectual and practical interests, and provides options for students who wish to take up a professional role in the history of science – such as Science Communication.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

*Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.*

N/A (this is my first year)

**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*

N/A

**For Examiners in the first year of appointment**

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Handbook?	Y
----	---	---

2.	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses to these?	Y
3.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Mentor?	Y

**For Examiners completing their term of appointment**

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	Y / N
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	Y / N
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y / N
7.	Have you acted as an External Examiner Mentor?	Y / N

*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**

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	Y
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Y
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y

The course is comparable with similar programmes. The combination of practical and intellectual elements is better conceived than at other institutions.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
It is evident that the course content is research driven, the research profiles of staff in the School reflect their interest. On an intellectual and practical level, the course is also useful for those who wish to undertake a tangential area such as science communication. So there is a good blend of courses which provides options for students in their career of research trajectory.		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N

*Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:*

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
<i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N

*Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:*

**Assessment and Feedback**

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
The assessment methods were appropriate and in line with intended learning outcomes. All information provided to the students makes this clear and this is also reflected in the comments provided to the students, which were of a very high standard. The rationale for marks awarded was clearly outlined by both examiners.		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y
I viewed some outstanding work – some of it was nearly of publishable quality. The main body of student work was very good and consistent with a cohort of students at this level.		
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i>		

### The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiner's role, powers and responsibilities in the examination process?	Y
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	N/A
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	N/A
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	N/A
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	N
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
The entire process was very well organised. The electronic packages of information were provided in a timely fashion, and I was emailed prior to their arrival that they were due to arrive. I received everything in good time, and		

the process was clearly communicated, as well as the due dates for the Board. I have nothing but praise for the administration of the process, particularly the assistance I received from .

**Other comments**

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

**Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)**

Title and Name of Examiner:	
Title and Name of Responder:	
Position*:	Head of School
Faculty / School of:	PRHS
Address for communication:	School of Philosophy, Religion & History of Science University of Leeds Leeds LS2 9JT
Email:	
Telephone:	

\*If the individual responding to the report is not the Head of School please state their position within the School.

**Completing the School response**

The completed School response (including the full original report) should be attached to an e-mail and sent to the Pro-Dean for Student Education in the relevant Faculty. Following approval by the Pro-Dean for Student Education, the School must send the response (including the full original report) directly to the External Examiner. A copy must also be emailed to the Quality Assurance Team at [qat@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:qat@leeds.ac.uk). External Examiners should receive a formal response no later than six weeks after receipt of the original report.

**Response to Points of innovation and/or good practice**

We are very pleased to receive praise from \_\_\_\_\_ both for the quality of feedback, and for the content of our programmes.

**Response to Enhancements made from the previous year**

N/A

**Response to Matters for Urgent Attention**

If any areas have been identified for urgent attention before the programme is offered again please provide a specific response to them here:

N/A

**Response to questions 1-7 (and related comments)**

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

No response required.

**Standards****Response to questions 8 to 16 (and related comments)**

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

No response required.

**Assessment and Feedback****Response to questions 17 to 19 (and related comments)**

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

We are delighted by \_\_\_\_\_'s comments on the high quality of student work, even reaching publishable standard in some cases.

## The Progression and Awards Process

### **Response to questions 20-35 (and related comments)**

*Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:*

We are glad to note that \_\_\_\_\_'s experience of the administrative side the process was positive, and that receiving material electronically was acceptable.

## Other comments

### **Response to items included in the 'Other Comments' section of the report**

It may be helpful to note here that, in view of relatively small numbers registering for the programmes, and the overlap between the MA in History & Philosophy of Science and other programmes, it has been decided to discontinue the MA in HPS wef 2018/19, though the MA in History of Science, Technology & Medicine will continue.