

**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):	Independent prescribing for nurses
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Independent prescribing for nurses
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	V300

**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.*  
The University continues to maintain high standards of assessment for this professional award. There are a range of assessments and very good links with 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.*  
The team have utilised the marking rubric more effectively to aid transparency of marking student work.

**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

**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?	N

**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?	Y

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

The programme has continued to develop and the team have looked at their marking schema and feedback styles. I would like there to be further consistency between marker feedback although I am happy all quality assurance processes have been carried out fully.

## 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
<p>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</p> <p>This is a rigorously assessed and structured programme however the PSRB requirements stipulate this amount of depth and it is indeed necessary for patient safety.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<p>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)</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<p>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</p>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y
<p>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here: Students work with a Designated Medical Practitioner who mentors and supports them. The University appears to have a good relationship with practice colleagues.</p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y
<p>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here: This programme clearly meets the Nursing and Midwifery prescribing standards.</p>		

## Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<p>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.</p>		

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
<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>The standards are high and ultimately not all students succeed as this is a rigorous programme. This is however similar to other institutions where there is equally a number of students who do not pass the examination requirements and this ensures patient safety is uppermost.</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><b>I would like to see greater consistency of feedback with all markers using the online rubric tool the same way e.g. in-text comments as well as the written summary comments. When multiple markers assess students this is not always evident although I am happy with the marks awarded and overall comments.</b></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?	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?	Y
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?	N
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y
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
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>The administration/sending of work to me has been problematic for the whole of my tenure. I receive several emails about work when one with all the work on it would be sufficient. This adds to the confusion over which work I have seen and which I have not. Other universities have admin staff that work much more efficiently and effectively and</p>		

this has been a real disappointment for me during my time in Leeds. I raised this point at the award board when I attended and other external examiners were experiencing the same problem.

I have to add that the academic team communicate exceptionally well and this has never been an issue with them.

#### Other comments

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

This is the end of my tenure at Leeds and I would like to thank the team for their support during my time with them. I am happy for you to forward my details on to a replacement EE if they should wish to talk to me about anything.

**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 Baines Wing 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 value your positive remarks and are pleased and reassured that you judge our modules to be of a comparable standard to that of yours and other institutions. It is encouraging to note that you believe the modules to be underpinned by an appropriate evidence base. The module team works hard to ensure that the taught content remains fit for purpose and is informed by the most up to date and relevant research.

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

The prescribing team have begun the process of standardising marking using the online rubric tool as suggested last year. The School has successfully recruited a lecturer practitioner prescriber and now that the team is at full strength we hope to fully normalise this approach within the new prescribing team. We are pleased that you are happy with the marks awarded and overall comments and feedback to students.

**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:

None identified.

**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:

We appreciate that you feel the academic team communicates exceptionally well with you and the regard is mutual.

**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:

It is reassuring to receive confirmation that the modules' structure, aims and learning outcomes remain appropriate and are robustly tested and that, where relevant, the modules continue to meet PSRB requirements.

## 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 note that you consider the modules and assessment processes to be rigorous and a positive means of testing students' knowledge and skills. Please see "Response to Enhancements" for action on other issues raised.

## 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 note that you have found some aspects of the administrative processes challenging. The procedures the School follows conform to University requirements and are being reviewed as part of our continual improvement process.

## Other comments

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

Thank you again for your report and for your support for the module team over the past 4 years, your friendly approach and pragmatic input will be greatly missed by the team.