

# 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:	Leeds Institute of Cardiovascular and Metabolic Medicine (LICAMM) School of Medicine
Subject(s):	<i>BSc Healthcare Science (Cardiac Physiology) MSc Advanced Practice</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	ARCS1106, HECS2199, HECS2194, HECS2200, HECS2202, HECS2203, HECS2204, HECS3077, HECS3264, ARCS3255, HECS3265, HECS3270, ARCS5205M
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BSc and MSc

### 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 course team provide an excellent Practitioner Training Programme, BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Cardiac Physiology). They demonstrate excellent student support and I commend their provision of excellent and very comprehensive electronic student feedback following submission of work.

#### Enhancements made from the previous year

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

Unable to comment as this is the first year of my tenure as external examiner

#### 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 <b>YES</b> and the response of the School to these? <b>NO</b>	See box
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor? <b>Yes, but the mentor never made any attempt to contact me.</b>	See comment

#### For Examiners completing their term of appointment

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

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
<p>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</p> <p>The structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes meet the requirements for the Modernising Scientific Careers Practitioner Training Programme BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science which are set by the National School of Healthcare Science (Health Education England).</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> <p>The programme team are Lecturer Practitioners that undertake clinical practice to inform their subject knowledge and use current research to influence their teaching and learning. Student research projects are relevant to the curriculum and can be used to influence future student learning.</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:</p> <p>The placement portfolio / clinical practice module outcomes meet the requirements for the Modernising Scientific Careers Practitioner Training Programme BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science which are set by the National School of Healthcare Science (Health Education England). The programme team maintain high clinical standards and ensure their clinical practice is current.</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:</p> <p>The programme meets and often exceeds the requirements of the National School of Healthcare Science and the Registration Council for Clinical Physiology (RCCP)</p>		

## Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
-----	---	---

*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.*

All assessment methods are appropriate to the learning outcomes of each module. All marks awarded were consistent and appropriate to the work submitted and assessment brief. All feedback is constructive highlighting areas for improvement where applicable.

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

*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:*

For the undergraduate programme the overall performance was very good with high academic standards demonstrated. Unfortunately the postgraduate performance was rather poor with evidence of the student's lack of critical analysis and independent thought. This was discussed with the module team and student support mechanisms are in place.

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

I would like to highly commend the course team for demonstrating excellent student support by their provision of very comprehensive electronic student feedback following submission of work.

### 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
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i>		

#### Other comments

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

Due to administrative staff restructuring within the department the dissemination of work for external examination was rather sporadic with very short turnaround times and deadline dates. It would be appreciated in future that any work to be checked is sent in a more timely fashion. However, the support from <<>> and <<>> course team has been excellent and made my first year as external examiner run smoothly.

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

Title and Name of Responder:	<<>>
Position*:	Director of Classified Undergraduate Studies
Faculty / School of:	<i>FMH – School of Medicine</i>
Address for communication:	<<>>
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 greatly appreciate the positive comments from the external examiner in this <<>> first year of office. We are particularly pleased with the comments regarding the quality of our programme and student support.

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

N/A – first year of appointment

**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:

Unfortunately the mentor arranged for the external examiner was on sick leave for the majority of the academic year, We apologise for not arranging alternative support at an earlier stage. Should such support be useful going forward, we are happy to arrange this for the current academic year. Copies of School responses to previous external examiner reports will also be provided.

**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:

From an academic perspective, we are very pleased by the external examiners comments linked to academic standards and research. We seek to ensure that the students receive a sound academic and research learning experience, enabling them to enter the workplace fit for practice and prepared for their new, challenging roles within Cardiac Physiology.

**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 provision of comprehensive electronic student feedback following submission of work, is something that we continue to develop. We seek to provide high levels of support and feedback to enable our student to reach their maximum potential. We appreciate the comments on the post graduate module. We agree that the work submitted by some students were poor. As discussed these students had not sought academic supervision prior to submission, on doing so they all passed at second attempt.

**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:*

No points were raised by the external examiner.

**Other comments**

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

We apologise for the administrative difficulties experienced by the external examiner this year. The Student Education Service (SES) team that supports the Healthcare Sciences programmes has been working with reduced staff FTE during 2016/17 following a resignation. All vacant posts have now been filled and the team restructured for the 2017/18 academic year.

We are grateful for the external examiners supportive comments regarding interaction with the programme leader and other members of academic staff.