

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17 QAT Received 07/11/2017

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	Medicine
Subject(s):	<i>International Health</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	
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.

This is my first year as EE for the BSc programme and I have not been made aware of substantial innovations as compared with last year.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

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 Examiner Handbook?	Y
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses to these?	EE report yes, but not the School's response
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	Y (previous EE)

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)?	See below
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y Compared with the <<>> BMedSc International Health programme

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

Q 11: There is no national, or international benchmark. There is literature on global health in undergraduate (and postgraduate) medical education, and the Leeds BMedSc programme more than meets expectations expressed in the articles below.

Oliver Johnson, Sarah Bailey et al. on behalf of the Global Health Learning Outcomes Working Group. [Global health learning outcomes for medical students in the UK](#) . Lancet 20 October 2011
DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(11\)61582-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61582-1)

Sarah C. Walpole, Clare Short e.a. Time to go global: a consultation on global health competencies for postgraduate doctors . Int Health 2016; 8: 317–323 doi:10.1093/inthealth/ihw019 Advance Access publication 30 May 2016

Mike Rowson , Abi Smith , et al The evolution of global health teaching in undergraduate medical curricula *Globalization and Health*20128:35DOI: 10.1186/1744-8603-8-35 Full text: <https://globalizationandhealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1744-8603-8-35>,

[Michael J. Peluso](#), [John Encandela](#), et al. Guiding principles for the development of global health education curricula in undergraduate medical education. *Medical Teacher* Volume 34, 2012 - [Issue 8](#) Pages 653-658 | Published online: 25 Jul2012.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2012.687848>

The course is based on well considered learning outcomes and educational content, with a highly appropriate width and breadth of subject matter.

In a face-to face session, the 2017-2018 students observed that the written material handed out during an earlier event, where BSc Intercalation programmes were presented, stood out by describing very clearly what is to be expected.

The lecturers/supervisors on the course have a firm grounding in and continuing engagement with research in middle and lower income countries, providing academic rigour and up to date relevance to the course.

Standards:

I read the handbook (as sent to students), the Code of assessment Practice 2016-17, and the minutes of the 28/9/2016 minutes of the Committee of Examiners meeting.

<p>On 27/9/2017 I spoke at length with the programme lead. I spoke with the programme lead with a group comprising most of the 2017-2018 students and subsequently and separately with 2 students in depth. I also attended the 27/9/2017 Committee of Examiners meeting.</p> <p>I perused the lists of marks, read 10 assignments and 4 assignment feedback reports. I would have marked the assignments in the same bandwidth. In the higher category, I would have marked some assignments lower – but still in the same bandwidth. However, it is important to note that External Examiners for the <<>> International Health BMedSc programme, which I lead, have commented that marks given by us may be too low, considering that the students are undergraduates and not in their two final years.</p> <p>I observed that students, not infrequently, are not as careful as they could have been with using measures such as incidence and prevalence, not making clear what is in the numerator and the denominator (or if there is a denominator or not). I have observed the same in (my) students in <<>>, in spite of efforts to remind them. Academic staff in Leeds confirmed that they equally remind students about this.</p> <p>In conclusion: standards are high, as evidenced by the above and by the examination results, and compare well with the <<>> BMedSc programme.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<p><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></p> <p>Teaching academics are actively engaged in ongoing, high class research, including field research in low and middle income countries, which is highly relevant to the programme. Many academics are based in the University of Leeds Nuffield Centre for International Health and Development, a World Health Organisation collaborative centre, enabling the teaching and supervision to be up to date with new developments in research and in health care practice.</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i></p> <p>The programme is not primarily intended, nor designed for training for a PHD. However, it will contribute significantly to students' research expertise, giving them a head start if they were to engage with PhD research later on in their careers. The basis for this statement is the information provided by the programme, such as details on research and teaching, and on analysing sample assignments, including original research projects.</p>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i></p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y
<p>The education of medical students falls under the governance of the General Medical Council, and the Higher Education Funding Council for England states that the University of Leeds can award "all types" of taught and research degrees, including Bachelor's degrees.</p>		
<p><i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i></p> <p>The Intercollegiate BSc programme delivers taught and assessed academic expertise, and contributes to further medical professional development. It is an enrichment to the standard undergraduate medical curriculum.</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.

There is a good variety in assessment: presentations, oral and written work. Apart from individual assessments, there is assessment of work produced in groups. Apart from delivering a summative assessment, this group work is also a welcome and important formative experience for research, and for working in medicine and health care in general, and in international work in particular. All assessments are highly relevant to the learning objectives. Furthermore, the assessments facilitate the personal development of students towards research-oriented medical professionalism. Awards are awarded appropriately in a structured, fair process.

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:

As per questions 17, there is a wide range of assessments, both individually, and group work; essays, oral and poster verbal presentations. Marks given are comparable to the <<>> BMedSc programme, with a good proportion of students achieving high levels.

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

The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiner's 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 / N Not all
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

While the current mode of submitting dissertations is wholly appropriate, an explorative discussion took place during the Committee of Examiners Meeting about possible alternative scenarios. These could include allowing students to write their dissertations in the format of a submission to an existing peer reviewed journal. In this scenario, subsequent to receiving examiners' feedback, students may choose to submit. There are advantages and disadvantages. Resource and equity implications may be prohibitive, in terms of markers' and supervisors' time, differences in word counts for students, and possibly fees for open access publications. The discussion was testimony to the reflective approach taken by the programme.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Responder:	<<>>
Position*:	Programme lead Intercolated BSc in International Health
Faculty / School of:	<i>Medicine and Health</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. 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

The External examiner has highlighted no major issues that need addressing.

<<>> highlights one particular issue I would like to take forward which is a consideration whether or not the final report could be submitted could be in the form of a peer reviewed essay. This mode of submission is being trialled with one of our other programmes and if a success it could be adopted for the intercalated BSc.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

NA

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:

NA

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:

NA

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:

NA

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:

NA

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:

NA

Other comments

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