

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

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

Faculty / School of:	School of Healthcare
Subject(s):	Various – mainly adult nursing
Programme(s) / Module(s):	HECS 1100 HECS 1098 HECS 1099 HECS 2008 HECS 2183 HECS 2184 HECS 2201 HECS 3248 HECS 3249 HECS 3254 HECS 3267 HECS 8007
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	Various

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

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

*Please highlight areas of innovation or good practice within the programmes or processes you have been involved with in this box.*

Good practice – marking and feedback to students – across modules, marking and feedback are of a very high standard.

I have been able to review documentation around the modules I am involved with. I have also looked at Blackboard and other supportive materials. These are cleanly presented, helpful, and informative.

I have also witnessed summative student presentations. These were well organised and professionally conducted. The standard of student presentations was consistently high. Marking of presentations was fair and robust.

I have not visited students in practice.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

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

All modules examined are of a high standard/quality.

**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 matters of urgent attention exist.

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

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiners Handbook?	Y
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?	Y
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	Unsure?

**For Examiners completing their term of appointment**

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	Y
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	Y
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y
7.	Have you acted as a External Examiner Mentor?	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?	Yes
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Yes
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Yes
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Yes
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Yes

*Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.*

As far as I can tell programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes are appropriate, well-structured and coherent.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y – though this is difficult to assess
-----	---	--

*Please explain how this is/could be achieved (examples might include: curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research)*

Yes. Students are including research findings appropriately in their work. Where research is critiqued, the levels of analysis demonstrated are generally good (level appropriate).

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
-----	--	---

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

No.

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y
-----	--	---

*Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:*

I do not examine this element of modules.

16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y
-----	--	---

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

The programme is well structured and organised. It meets PSRB requirements.

## Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Yes
<p><i>Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs, in particular: 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.</i></p> <p>Across modules examined – modules appear to be well designed and, if the standard of student submissions reflects teaching quality, then that quality is of a high standard.</p>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Yes
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Yes
<p><i>Please comment on 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:</i></p> <p>Student submissions obviously vary in quality. However, overall, generally good/high standards are achieved by students. Students at Leeds easily meet and outpace the abilities of students at many other institutions.</p>		
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i></p> <p>Across modules, feedback to students is consistently fulsome, robust, and of high quality. Educators clearly put a great deal of time and energy into providing feedback.</p>		

## The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiners role, powers and responsibilities in the examination process?	Yes
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Yes
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Yes
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Yes
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Yes
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Yes – when appropriate
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Yes
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Yes
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Yes
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Yes
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Yes
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Yes
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Yes
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Yes

34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Yes
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Yes
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>Processes and procedures are well established and well delivered.</p>		

**Other comments**

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

I would like to thank all support staff for their prompt assistance, professional manor, and patience.

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

Title and Name of Responder:	
Position*:	Director of Student Education
Faculty / School of:	School of Healthcare
Address for communication:	The 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**

Thank you for your External Examiner report. It was pleasing to read you identified the marking and feedback to students as good practice. In the past academic year the School of Healthcare has placed emphasis on marking and feedback to ensure parity across modules and programmes and work is continuing in this area.

You highlighted the Minerva system and identified the clear presentation, in the past year, the School of Healthcare has responded to student evaluation regarding the way in which the material is presented and is planning to undertake further work to further standardise module presentation.

Your attendance at the HECS 3248 Theory and Practice 5 Oral Presentations was appreciated and your report highlighted the positive organisation and professionalism observed.

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

It is pleasing to read that you consider the modules to be of a high standard.

**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:

No matters raised requiring urgent attention.

**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:

It is pleasing to note that you are content with the arrangements for managing your appointment. All external examiners who are new to the role are provided with a mentor from outwith the University in their first year to provide an additional source of support. Thank you for agreeing to mentor a new external examiner to the School during the 2017/2018 session.

## 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:*

The students are encouraged to support their assessments with published research findings although some students do struggle with this aspect of the programme; students are offered academic support within the modules to ensure understanding of the module outcomes in relation to the assessment. Whilst all the modules relate to practice, some more explicitly than others, and it is expected that students would reference this in their assessments, the main clinical assessment document is the PAD/OAR where clinical skills and Professional Practice Standards are recorded, and these are made available to the relevant external examiners at the end of each year when they attend the final examination board of the session.

## 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:*

It is pleasing to read that you consider high standard to have been maintained across the modules and within the programme, and which is subsequently reflected in the overall standards achieved by the students. The module teams and programme teams work hard to provide meaningful feedback to students and it is gratifying that you have commented on this.

## 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:*

The programme team, module teams and SES staff work closely to ensure the high standard expected is met. Thank you for recognising the assistance provided to you by the SES, this is most appreciated and your comments will be fed-back to them.

## Other comments

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

Your input, comments and support over the past year have been invaluable and very much appreciated. In particular we would like to thank you for the additional workload you so willingly assumed over the last year and which ensured that the modules and programmes continued to be appropriately quality assured. We are pleased to confirm that the unforeseen difficulties which prompted this extra work have now been addressed. The team very much looks forward to continue to work with you in the current session.