

**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 Medicine LICAMM
Subject(s):	<i>Cardiovascular Medicine</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	BSc Clinical Sciences (Cardiovascular Medicine)
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BSc

**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 was particularly impressed by the Paper Commentary module, which requires the student to produce a critical summary of an original research paper of their choice. This exercise gives the student a good opportunity to learn how to interpret research findings and to understand the importance of questioning the data rather than taking the authors view at face value. I also very much enjoyed the oral presentations given by the students on their research projects, and it was clear the students were keen to convey the results of their hard work over the year to an audience. It also gave the students an excellent opportunity to demonstrate their level of understanding of the topic in a way that is not always demonstrated through the written reports.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

*Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.*  
Not applicable as this is the first year of duties

**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 areas of immediate concern

**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?	N
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 / 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 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*

## 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

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

The course is well designed, with a clear set of learning outcomes, and includes a variety of assessment methods that aims to assess the students' abilities in different ways. Thus the traditional methods of written examination is complemented well by written assessments, a research project and oral presentation. As a whole the course is informative, varied and challenging for the students.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
-----	---	---

*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)*

The topics of the research projects in the final year of the course are informed by, and constitute part of, the research activities of the supervisor. I found the topics covered in the projects were wide-ranging and in-depth, and form the oral presentations the students have clearly acquired a thorough grasp of research methodology and the impact of the research that they undertook.

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
-----	--	---

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

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
<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>The assessment methods range from traditional written examination, through written assignments that test the critical and interpretative skills of the students to preparation of a written research report. All of these methods are highly appropriate to the intended learning outcomes and sufficiently rigorous to identify students working at different levels of performance. Double marking was employed for all assessments and, on the whole, demonstrated good agreement between markers – to me this demonstrates that all markers are working to similar criteria and interpreting them correspondingly. I marked several examination scripts and, in the main, agreed with both markers. However I did find one marker to be rather generous in their marking, and another slightly more rigorous, than I would have been – this may reflect differences in what I would have expected to be contained within an answer and the expectations of the markers. The production of “model answers” or bullet points of facts that are expected to be included in the answer would be useful – I appreciate this requires additional effort on the part of the academic staff it is nevertheless helpful for an external examiner as this demonstrates the expected level of understanding, which will inevitably be determined by what has been delivered to the students in their lectures etc.</p> <p>The spread of degree classifications was in line with what I would have expected based upon the pieces of work (examples from each type of assessment) that I scrutinised.</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 students demonstrated a range of academic standards consistent with other courses I have served on as external examiner. The range of degree classifications was slightly higher as the awards made were either 1<sup>st</sup> Class or 2i, with no lower second class degrees awarded. However, having had the opportunity to mark the oral presentations of each student I could see that they were a highly engaged and intelligent cohort that performed within the classifications awarded.</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>		

## 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?	Y
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y
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?	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>		

#### Other comments

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

**Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report****Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)**

Title and Name of Responder:

Position\*:

Faculty / School of:

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

Programme Lead	
Medicine	

\*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**

Particular praise was given to the Paper commentary module with the opportunities given to students to interpret data. also particularly praised the oral presentations of the student's research projects as allowing students a real opportunity to demonstrate their level of understanding.

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

Not applicable – first year

**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

**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:

As a new external examiner previous year's examiners reports and schools responses would have been a useful tool but were not made available. We apologise to for this oversight in not providing these and we will offer the opportunity to see these if wishes. Going forward, process will be put in place so that previous reports and responses are made available to all external examiners.

**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 course was described as informative, varied and challenging to the students.

Offering wide ranging and in depth projects allowing students to appreciate the impact of the research they undertook.

## 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 assessment methods were recognised as appropriate by the external examiner and double marking was recognised. Degree classifications was in line with the work scrutinized. The School understands that bullet points/model answers are available for markers during the examination process. The School will encourage the sharing of these with

## 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 external confirmed all points.

## Other comments

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

No other comments were raised.