

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

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

Faculty / School of:

Faculty of Medicine and Health, School of Healthcare

Subject(s):

Psychology and Sociology modules offered within the School of Healthcare

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Academic year 2016/17 - DAHS3001, DONE3003, DAHS 3007,

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

MSc, BSc (Hons), BA, BA (Hons) BHS-NUR-ADV BS-NEUROSCI ND-HECS8 ND-PSYC8 BS-PHYS BS-NUR-AD11, BA (Hons) Social Work, BA-LAW/CIC, BA-ED/CHLDST, ND-COMM8, BS-ECOL/EB, BA-SOC, ND-BIOLS, ND-SOSP8, ND-HECS8, BA-PHILP&SCT, BA-SPA-SOC, BS-FOOD/FSC7, BS-MED-SCI, BS-GEOG, BS-HMPS10, BSc (Hons) Radiography, PASS

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.**I cannot comment at programme level. However, at module level examples of good practice include transparent and consistent marking processes along with clear, constructive feedback to students. The addition to module handbooks of the 'School of Healthcare Model of Academic Supervision' offers students a very useful timeline around which to plan, organise and manage their workload***Enhancements made from the previous year***Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.**I cannot comment at programme level.***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**I cannot comment at programme level.***For Examiners in the first year of appointment**

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

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment? I cannot comment at programme level	Y / N N/A – I have examined work at modular level
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made? Although I have demonstrated willingness to attend, my presence at Boards has not been considered necessary.	Y / N Unclear
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y / N Unclear
7.	Have you acted as a 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

Over the period of my appointment, and in particular over the past 12 months, the pass rate and grades awarded on the modules I have examined have decreased, and fewer students have opted to enrol on the modules. The reasons for this are not clear.

Standards

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study? I cannot comment at overall programme level, however, the content of the modules I have examined are appropriate for students undertaking health and social care related programmes	Y / N Please see comment
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met? I cannot comment at overall programme level, however, the intended learning outcomes and assessment methods of the modules I have examined offered students the opportunity to meet the L/Os.	Y / N Please see comment
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award? I cannot comment at overall programme level, however, the intended learning outcomes and assessment methods of the modules I have examined are commensurate with the level of the award.	Y / N Please see comment
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Y / N
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions? I cannot comment at overall programme level, however, modules I have examined are comparable with other institutions with which I am familiar.	Y / N Please see comment

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

I cannot comment on the programme structure. I have highlighted previously that I would have found it useful to have an overall view of the programmes in order to comment more effectively on how the modules I examine fit within the programmes. However, what I can say is that the modules I examine have Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) that are clearly appropriate for students undertaking health and social care related programmes.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y / N
<i>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)</i>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	Y / N
<i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i>		
I cannot comment at programme level		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y / N
<i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i>		
I cannot comment at programme level		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y / N
<i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i>		
As previously stated, I cannot comment at programme level.		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y / N
<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>I cannot comment at programme level. However, the ILOs for the modules I have examined are clearly appropriate for students on health and social care related programmes. The Module Handbooks demonstrate a range of summative and formative assessment methods, along with clear marking processes. All scripts first marked by the Module Leader and moderated by the same Moderator ensuring consistency; marking process is transparent and clearly described in the Module Leader and Moderator reports. With the exception of some MSc scripts at the beginning of my tenure, scripts across the modules are marked through Turnitin with feedback given as in-text comments and overall comments in the general comments box. Feedback to students is clearly written, focussed and supportive, offering clear academic guidance as to how work could be enhanced to achieve a higher grade. Assignment guidance is offered to students within the Module Handbooks along with electronic links to further generic guidance. The marking criteria appropriate to the level of the assessment is available to students. The grades awarded (classifications) clearly reflect the marking criteria used by the markers and map clearly to benchmarks across the sector.</p>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y / N
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y / N
<i>I cannot comment at programme level. However, the assessment methods and academic support/guidance offered at module level to students gave them opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of module ILOs – and in some cases to a high standard.</i>		
<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>Over the course of my term as an External Examiner I have enjoyed reading the assessed work, the students appeared to be engaged with the material and enjoying the modules. The modules I examined attracted high pass rates (100% pass rate was not unusual) along with a high number of students achieving grades of 2:1 and above. The best scripts demonstrate clear engagement with the ILOs producing confident and focused analyses that are theoretically and empirically informed, well presented and supported by a wide range of literature. Weaker scripts also demonstrate grasp and application, however, they</p>		

lack the depth of analysis, use of expression and/or structure/organisation found in the stronger scripts. The standard of recently assessed work suggests limited student engagement with module content, learning resources and/or academic support on offer, the reasons for this are not clear. As before, a range of teaching methods and learning resources continue to be in evidence within the Module Handbooks and Blackboard areas (VLE). However, the overall standard of the work is comparable with other institutions with which I am familiar. The use of the VLE (Blackboard) for the modules I have examined is also comparable with other institutions with which I am familiar.

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:

A previous M/L for DONE 3003 used a very useful four point framework to guide students on how the School's level 3 marking grid is operationalised in the marking of the assignments. I felt that this offered students clear guidance in relation to the marking process under the headings of knowledge and understanding, analysis, evaluation and presentation. Feedback was then structured within Turnitin under the aforementioned four headings providing consistency in how feedback is presented to students as well as offering them focused guidance on how to improve on each of the four elements in future assignments to increase their grade.

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 / N
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y / N
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y / N N/A
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y / N
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y / N N/A
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y / N
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated? Assignment feedback has always been clear, constructive and supportive.	Y / N
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y / N
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y / N
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board? Please see comment below.	Y / N
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting? My presence has never been considered to be necessary. Please see comment below.	Y / N
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N N/A
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N N/A
Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:		

As documented in previously, the administrative element of my work as External Examiner has been conducted electronically and has in the main run smoothly. My presence at the Board of Examiners has not been encouraged/considered necessary, the reason for this has never been made clear.

I have received some work at very short notice, I thus requested some advance notice of when to expect assessed work in order to help plan my workload to best effect. I was duly contacted by Module Leaders 1-2weeks in advance of work being sent. I would have found it useful to have a list of key dates regarding Board of Examiner meetings along with copies of recommendations made at the meetings. However, these have never been made available to me.

As documented previously, I would have found it useful to have an overall view of the programme(s) within which the modules I examined sat.

Other comments

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

Again, as documented previously, I consider 'Leeds for Life' and its links within the modules to be a very useful resource for students.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Faculty / School of:

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

Director of Student Education

School of Healthcare

Baines Wing
The University of Leeds
LEEDS LS2 9JT

*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. 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 positive comments relating to the transparency of our assessment processes and the quality of the feedback provided to students. We aim to support students throughout the modules, offering direction to additional reading, out of class tasks, provide assessment related examples, group and individual academic supervision. We offer structured feedback and enable students to clearly see what they have done well and how and in what ways they could improve.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

There has been module lead changes that have meant that material has been rethought and rewritten. Students can access wider reading and link to visual media to scaffold their learning. Where appropriate, contemporary research leads the focus of sessions.

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:

The examiner requests to have sight of programme related material so that she can offer judgement regarding how these modules sit in the programme contexts. These modules are discovery modules and therefore students from across the university can access them. The School does not have access to the varied programme contents that students enter these modules from; however, the external examiner has been directed to the programme specification for each programme so that a general overview of the programme can be obtained and the relevance of the choice of Discovery module understood. Each module cohort can include students from very different programmes. This does call for flexibility in teaching style and a demand for a depth and breadth of knowledge to be able to accommodate each cohort. Regardless of student background, we aim to deliver honours level material and as agreed by the external examiner, we work with intended learning outcomes suitable for honours level study and relevant especially for individuals on health and social care related programmes.

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:

Fewer students enrolled on these modules last year, the reasons for which are unknown. Some students really engaged with the module, achieving excellent grading. Others struggled with the demand for criticality in their

writing. It should be noted that a number of students on one of these modules had significant personal issues that impacted on their academic abilities. The attendance of these students was patchy and again despite the offer and receipt of academic supervision they struggled with their assessment.

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:

As mentioned earlier, this is a Discovery module with students enrolling from different and varied programme backgrounds, with students opting to study the module to broaden their knowledge base beyond the approved curriculum for their programme. This calls for flexibility in teaching style and session content in order to reach each student. As supported by the external examiner we do research lead our sessions and work with appropriate intended learning outcomes for honours level. Although some students do struggle at points, the pass rate is generally high.

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:

The examiner cannot comment at programme level as the focus of her remit is on a suite of modules, which can be accessed from students across the University and are especially relevant for students on health and social care related programmes. We aim to include all module relevant information in the handbooks and clear academic guidance regarding grading. The examiner is supportive of our module handbooks and academic guidance offered within.

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 examiner has been in receipt of sufficient module related information and documentation and can access VLE (Minerva) content. Whilst the external examiner has commented that she has not received programme level information, this is because the modules she is reviewing are Discovery modules. Each marking session is usually completed a number of weeks prior to the assessment boards and therefore the majority of scripts should be available for examination with notice. Where there are late submissions or issues of resubmission and investigation this could elongate the process or mean that odd scripts may need checking at less notice. We apologise if notice has not been sufficient and that you have not received an invitation to the Examination Board and will endeavour to rectify this with subsequent submissions to your successor.

Other comments

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

Leeds for life is a good resource for our students and especially useful for personal tutors to have an overview of each students module choices and progress. The virtual resources available and accessible for students and tutors at Leeds are valued and enhance the students learning experience.